A REDACTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS WITH REGARD TO THE QUESTION OF THE SOURCES OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS

By

AROLD
JOHN H. SIEBER

A Dissertation presented to the General Faculty
of the Claremont Graduate School in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

1965

We, the undersigned, certify that we have read this dissertation and approve it as adequate in scope and quality for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Ernest W Tune
Visiting Examiner

Faculty Reader

Ernest W Tune
Faculty Reader

Supervisory Committee

Hans Dieter Betz (for J. M. Robinson, in absentia)
Chairman

Hans Dieter Betz

Wm. H. Brownlee

Date May 16, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS vii

INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter

I. THE REJECTION AT NAZARETH 21

Matthew 13:53-58, Mark 6:1-6, Luke 4:16-30 and Saying 31a

II. THE BEATITUDES 25

Matthew 5:3-12, Luke 6:20-23, and Sayings 54, 68, and 69

III. THE SIMILIES OF SALT AND LIGHT 40

Matthew 5:13-16, Mark 4:21, Luke 8:16 and 11:33, and Sayings 32 and 33b

IV. ON ALMSGIVING, PRAYER, AND FASTING 49

Matthew 6:1-18 and Saying 62b

V. ON TREASURES 56

Matthew 6:19-21, Luke 12:33-34 and Saying 76b

VI. THE SINGLE EYE 62

Matthew 6:22-33, Luke 11:34-36 and Saying 24

VII. ON CARES 63

Matthew 6:25-34, Luke 12:22-31 and Saying 36

VIII. ON JUDGING 70

Matthew 7:3-5, Luke 6:41-42 and Saying 26

IX. ON CASTING PEARLS 76

Matthew 7:6 and Saying 93

Chapter Page

X. THE ANSWER TO PRAYER 81

Matthew 7:7-11, Luke 11:9-13 and Sayings 92 and 94

XI. THE TEST OF GOODNESS 85

Matthew 7:16 and 12:34b-35, Luke 6:44-45 and Saying 45

XII. TWO CLAIMANTS TO DISCIPLESHIP 92

Matthew 8:18-22, Luke 9:57-60 and Saying 86

XIII. THE QUESTION ABOUT FASTING 96

Matthew 9:14-17, Mark 2:18-22, Luke 5:33-39 and Sayings 104 and 47

XIV. EXHORTATION TO FEARLESS CONFESSION 106

Matthew 10:26-27, Mark 4:22, Luke 8:17 and 12:2-3 and Sayings 5, 6 and 33a

XV. DIVISIONS IN HOUSEHOLDS 113

Matthew 10:34-36, Luke 12:49, 51-53 and Sayings 10 and 16

XVI. CONDITIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP 119

Matthew 10:37-39, Luke 14:26-27 and Sayings 55 and 101

XVII. CHRIST'S TESTIMONY TO THE BAPTIST 127

Matthew 11:7-11, Luke 7:24-28, and Sayings 78 and 46

XVIII. JESUS' THANKSGIVING TO THE FATHER 134

Matthew 11:25-27, Luke 10:21-22 and Saying 61

XIX. COME UNTO ME 137

Matthew 11:28-30 and Saying 90

XX. ON COLLUSION WITH SATAN 141

Matthew 12:29, Mark 3:27, Luke 11:21 and Saying 35

XXI. THE SIN AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT 145

Matthew 12:31-32, Mark 3:28-30, Luke 12:10 and Saying 44

Chapter Page

XXII. CHRIST'S REAL BRETHREN 150

Matthew 12:46-50, Mark 3:31-35, Luke 8:19-21
and Saying 99

XXIII. THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER 155

Matthew 13:3-9, Mark 4:3-9, Luke 8:5-8 and Saying 9

XXIV. WHOEVER HAS, IT SHALL BE GIVEN TO HIM 163

Matthew 13:12, Mark 4:25, Luke 8:18b, Matthew 26:29,
Luke 19:26 and Saying 41

XXV. THE PARABLE OF THE TARES AMONG THE WHEAT 167

Matthew 13:24-30 and Saying 57

XXVI. THE PARABLES OF THE MUSTARD SEED AND LEAVEN 171

Matthew 13:31-33, Mark 4:30-32, Luke 13:18-21
and Sayings 20 and 96

XXVII. THE PARABLES OF THE HIDDEN TREASURE AND
THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE 181

Matthew 13:44-46 and Sayings 109 and 76a

XXVIII. THE PARABLE OF THE NET 187

Matthew 13:47-50 and Saying 8

XXIX. DEFILEMENT: TRADITIONAL AND REAL 191

Matthew 15:1-20, Mark 7:1-23, Luke 6:39
and Sayings 14c, 40 and 34

XXX. PETER'S CONFESSION 197

Matthew 16:13-20, Mark 8:27-30, Luke 9:18-21
and Saying 13a

XXXI. THE DISPUTE ABOUT GREATNESS 198

Matthew 18:1, Mark 9:33, Luke 9:46 and Saying 12a

XXXII. FAITH MOVES MOUNTAINS 201

Matthew 17:20, 18:19 and 21:21, Mark 11:23, Luke 17:6
and Sayings 48 and 106

Chapter Page
XXXIII. THE LOST SHEEP 205

Matthew 18:12-14, Luke 15:3-7 and Saying 107

XXXIV. COMMISSIONING THE SEVENTY 208

Matthew 9:37-38 and 10:16, Luke 10:2, 7-8
and Sayings 73, 39b and 14b

XXXV. THE BLESSEDNESS OF JESUS' MOTHER 211

Luke 11:27-28 and 23:29 and Saying 79

XXXVI. THE PARABLE OF THE RICH MAN 215

Luke 12:13-21 and Sayings 72 and 63

XXXVII. INTERPRETING THE TIMES 219

Luke 12:54-56 and Saying 91

XXXVIII. ON THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD 223

Luke 17:20-21 and Sayings 3a and 113

XXXIX. THE WARNING OF THE PAROUSIA 227

Matthew 24:37-40, Luke 17:26-35 and Saying 61a

XL. THE PARABLE OF THE WICKED HUSBANDMEN 231

Matthew 21:33-41, Mark 12:1-12, Luke 20:9-16
and Sayings 65 and 66

XLI. THE PARABLE OF THE MARRIAGE FEAST 241

Matthew 22:1-14, Luke 14:16-24, and Saying 64

XLII. ON PAYING TRIBUTE TO CAESAR 244

Matthew 22:15-22, Mark 12:13-17, Luke 20:20-26
and Saying 100

XLIII. THE GREAT COMMANDMENT 249

Matthew 22:34-40, Mark 12:28-34, Luke 10:25-28
and Saying 25

Chapter Page

XLIV. WOE TO THE SCRIBES AND THE PHARISEES 250

Matthew 23:13 and 25, Luke 11:52 and 39
and Sayings 39a and 89

XLV. WATCHFULNESS AND FAITHFULNESS 255

Matthew 24:43-44, Luke 12:35, 39-40
and Sayings 21b and 103

CONCLUSION 260

BIBLIOGRAPHY 264

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

-bo	Bohairic translation
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
Mus	Le Muséon
NTS	New Testament Studies
-sa	Sahidic translation
ThLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung
ThR	Theologische Rundschau
ThS	Theological Studies
VC	Vigiliae Christianae

INTRODUCTION

The Gospel according to Thomas, one of the books contained in the important Coptic manuscripts from the vicinity of Nag-Hammadi in Egypt, has aroused great interest among students of the New Testament. It takes its name from a colophon which reads: *ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ ⲡⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲑⲱⲙⲁⲥ*. Modern commentators in English have also used a shorter title, the Gospel of Thomas, to refer to this work. German scholars, on the other hand, seem prone to abbreviate the title simply as *Thomas* or *Thomas-Evangelium* (ThEv). Since all but the last of these can be used in English, they seem to be the logical titles to be used for the sake of variety as well as for the sake of brevity.

The wide spread interest in the Gospel of Thomas has resulted from the fact that it contains 114 Sayings which it attributes to Jesus.[1] Thomas thus provides a rich new vein of material for those who have been engaged in the study of the sayings of Jesus that are preserved elsewhere. Although popular interest in this apocryphal gospel has now tapered off in America, most of the detailed work necessary for a critical evaluation of the importance of Thomas for the study of our Synoptic Gospels remains to be done. It is the intent of the present study to accomplish some of that assessment.

---

[1] *The Gospel according to Thomas*, Coptic text established and translated by A. Guillaumont, H.-Ch. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till, and Yassah 'abd al Masih (New York: Harper & Bros., 1959).

Thomas, because of its significant affinities with our Synoptic Gospels, is somewhat unique among apocryphal gospels. M. R. James lists portions of eight such gospels preserved in the writings of early Christian authors,[2] Greek and Coptic fragments of seven others,[3] ten Infancy Gospels,[4] and four Passion Gospels. Since most of these contain fanciful and legendary material, they have little or no value for the study of the Synoptic Gospels. The opportunities presented to us by the Gospel of Thomas are, therefore, particularly exciting and important. In it we have for the first time a complete copy of an apocryphal gospel which has a direct bearing on our study of the Synoptic Gospels. Furthermore, since this gospel originated sometime in the middle of the second century A.D., it appeared at a time in which the superiority of our written Synoptic Gospels over the oral tradition was not definitely established.[5]

---

[2] The Apocryphal New Testament, trans. M. R. James (London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1960), pp. v-vii.

[3] One group of these Greek fragments, previously known as the Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus, is now recognized to represent fragments of a Greek version of the Gospel according to Thomas. Prior to the discovery of the new Coptic Thomas, these three fragments, Pap. Ox. 1, 654, 655, were not even considered to be part of the same book. For the relationship between the Greek and Coptic texts, one may consult the following: H.-Ch. Puech, "The Gospel of Thomas," Edgar Hennecke New Testament Apocrypha, ed. W. Schneemelcher, trans. R. Mcl. Wilson, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), I, pp. 278-307; J. Jeremias and W. Schneemelcher, "Sayings-Collections on Papyrus," Edgar Hennecke New Testament Apocrypha, ed. W. Schneemelcher, trans. R. Mcl. Wilson, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), I, pp. 97-113; J. A. Fitzmeyer, "The Oxyrhynchus Logoi of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas," ThS, XX(1959), 505-560; Otfried Hofius, "Das koptische Thomasevangelium und die Oxyrhynchus Papyri N. 1, 654 und 655." Evangelische Theologie, I(1960), 21-42, 182-192.

[4] The Infancy Gospel of Thomas has no relationship to the newly discovered Gospel.

The similarities between Thomas and our Synoptic Gospels are easily recognizable. Thomas contains many of the sayings of Jesus which are already familiar to us from the New Testament. Some of Thomas' versions of these sayings are almost exactly identical with the New Testament texts, while others are so different that it is difficult to be certain that they represent the same saying at all. Saying 34, for example, is almost identical with Matthew 15:14par:

> If a blind man leads a blind man, both of them fall into a pit.

Saying 8, the Parable of the Net, is quite different from Matthew 13:47-49:

> And He said: The Man is like a wise fisherman who cast his net into the sea, he drew it up from the sea full of small fish; among them he found a large and good fish, that wise fisherman, he threw all the small fish down into the sea, he chose the large fish without regret. Whoever has ears to hear let him hear.[6]

From such similarities it follows that many of the same types of sayings are found in both Thomas and the Synoptic Gospels. Thomas contains parables, beatitudes, "I" sayings, didactic sayings, wisdom sayings and even a few sayings that may be classed as apophthegms.[7]

---

[5] For the dating of Thomas one may compare H.-Ch. Puech, "Thomas" in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, p. 305; E. Haenchen, "Literatur zum Thomasevangelium," ThR, XXVII(1961-1962), 155; R. McL. Wilson, Studies in the Gospel of Thomas, (London: A. K. Mowbray, 1960), p. 6.

[6] Sayings 8 and 34 are here quoted from the translation given in the Harper edition. Elsewhere in the following pages the translations that appear represent the translations of the writer. Those translations represent, in turn, both a different attempt at understanding the Coptic text and a comparison of the various translations of Thomas to date.

[7] We have relied on Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. John Marsh (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), for the names of the various types of sayings.

Another trait of Thomas' Gospel which is easily recognizable to the student of the New Testament is its method of tying together a group of sayings by means of a catchword. It is quite clear that the use of such catchword connections played a part in the collection of some of the material which is contained in our Synoptic Gospels.[8] Although the rationale for the order of the entire collection of Thomas' sayings still remains a mystery, a sizeable number of Thomas' sayings are also connected with each other by means of a catchword. Sayings 2 and 3, for example, are connected by the Coptic root ⲣⲟ which appears as the verb "he will reign" near the end of Saying 2 and as the noun "Kingdom" in Saying 3.

These and other similarities between Thomas and our Synoptic Gospels, coupled with Thomas' second century origin, have made Thomas an important new factor in the study of the Synoptic Gospels. It is an extremely happy coincidence that such an extra-canonical source of synoptic material should be uncovered at this time in the history of New Testament studies. After several decades of Form Criticism almost all scholars accept the fact that our Gospels are mosaics, that is, they are literary compositions which were created by the Synoptic Evangelists out of many separate pieces of the Synoptic Tradition. The tasks of the form critics have been twofold: first, to uncover the individual units of material used by the evangelists; and second, to seek to determine the age of those units through an analysis of the form in which it appears.[9]

---

[8] Thaddeus Soiron, in his book Die Logia Jesu ("Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen," VI; Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1916), shows on pp. 52-54 how in Matthew 5:14-16, part of the Sermon on the Mount, a series of sayings is held together by these catchwords: φῶς, λύχνον, λυχνίαν, λάμπει, λαμψάτω, and φῶς. Since neither Mark nor Luke contain the two sayings about light which appear in Matthew 5:14a and 16, it seems obvious that Matthew himself used the word φῶς as a catchword to join them to the sayings about putting a lamp on a lampstand.

Today, the emphasis in Synoptic studies has shifted, if only slightly, from form critical study to a more detailed analysis of the editorial work of the evangelists. The primary concern is now, not so much the pieces of the Synoptic Tradition themselves, but the manner in which Matthew, Mark and Luke put those pieces together to form the Synoptic Gospels.[10] This relatively new approach to the study of the Synoptic Gospels is called in German, Redaktionsgeschichte, which can be best translated as "redactional analysis." This method is represented by such works as The Theology of St. Luke by Hans Conzelmann and Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium by Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and H. J. Held.[11] Studies such as these have enabled us to see the editorial traits and the theological concerns of the Synoptic Evangelists with greater clarity than ever before. They also mean that we can understand more clearly than before which of the differences in sayings given by more than one Evangelist are most likely the work of the

---

[9] Rudolf Bultmann, "The Study of the Synoptic Gospels," Form Criticism, ed. and trans. F. C. Grant (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962), pp. 25-31.

[10] It should not be overlooked that Bultmann provided both the precedent for such studies as well as many of the basic insights now being pursued in Part III of The History of the Synoptic Tradition.

[11] Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1960); Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and H. J. Held, Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium ("Wissenschaftlische Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament," Bd. 1; The Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins Neukirchen Kreis Moers, 1961). The latter volume is now also available in an English translation as Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, trans. Percy Scott (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963).

Evangelist himself. Bornkamm-Barth-Held show, for example, that the concept of righteousness plays an important role in Matthew's theology. When the Beatitude given in Matthew 5:6 is compared with its counterpart in Luke 6:21, one of the major differences between the two is the appearance of the word "righteousness" in Matthew's account. It is quite probable, therefore, that Matthew himself has interpreted this saying about hunger in a way which fitted his theological concern.[12]

By providing us with this clearer picture of the method in which the Evangelists reworded their material, redactional analysis has also given us the best tool possible to assess accurately whether or not Thomas drew on our written Synoptic Gospels as the sources for the synoptic sayings in his book. If the sayings tradition of Thomas reveals to us the same editorial traits and changes as do our canonical Gospels, it is almost certain that those Gospels were the sources used by Thomas. To put it another way, if Thomas did derive his synoptic sayings from our canonical Gospels, or from one or more of them his work ought to reflect their particular handling of the tradition to a considerable degree. The converse, of course, is equally true.

While the similarities between Thomas and the Synoptic Gospels have evoked a great deal of interest, the differences between them have not been unnoticed. The most striking contrast is the lack in Thomas of the type of narrative material with which we are familiar in the Synoptic Gospels. To be sure, there are in Thomas some very brief narrative sentences used as introductions to a few of the sayings; for example, Saying 22:

---

[12] Bornkamm-Barth-Held, Überlieferung, pp. 116, 130-134.

> Jesus saw the children who were being suckled.
> He said to his disciples: These children . . .[13]

In the New Testament, however, this kind of narrative material is itself introduced by other connecting phrases so that the progression from saying to saying and from deed to deed gives the appearance of an homogeneous, coherent story. The repetitious use of καί in Mark's Gospel is perhaps the simplest example of the way in which the separate pieces were joined together. Mark 8, for example, begins with a short, scene-setting narrative which introduces the story of the feeding of the four thousand. Then, in quite rapid succession come seven sections of material all connected with one another by Mark's connecting link καί: verse 10, and immediately he got into the boat . . . ; verse 12, and the Pharisees came . . . ; verse 13, and he left them . . . ; verse 14, now (καί) they had forgotten . . . ; verse 22, and they came . . . ; verse 27, and Jesus went on . . . ; verse 31, and he began to teach them . . . The narrative material which does occur in Thomas does not serve at all as an attempt to combine the sayings into a continuous narrative; rather each small segment of narrative material represents only a very brief introduction to the particular saying with which it is connected. Instead of the appearance of connected narrative, therefore, we find in Thomas the sayings are simply listed one after the other. In fact, if it were not for the introductory formulas of "Jesus said" and "And he said" in Thomas, we would be hard put in many cases to divide one saying from the other.[14] In at least this one respect, therefore, the Gospel according to Thomas represents quite a different type of literature from that represented by our Gospels.

---

[13] Nineteen sayings in Thomas have such introductory narrative: Sayings 12, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 37, 43, 51, 52, 53, 60, 72, 79, 99, 100, 104, 113, 114.

[14] Even as it is, each of the commentators on the Coptic Thomas

The paucity of narrative material in Thomas does not mean, nevertheless, that what narrative there is is unimportant. On the contrary, it is especially in these short narrative introductions that we should expect to find the editorial traits of our Synoptic Evangelists most easily if their Gospels were the sources from which Thomas drew his sayings.

There are, of course, other significant differences between our Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of Thomas. We have noted previously that many familiar types of sayings occur in Thomas. We ought also to note that Thomas lacks some types of sayings which play extremely important roles in the canonical Gospels. Thomas, for example, reports none of the deeds or actions of Jesus, such as the cleansing of the temple or the calling of his disciples. One of the most striking of these differences is the complete absence in Thomas of the accounts of the miracles of Jesus. There is not one miracle story among all of the 114 sayings in Thomas! Indeed, if Thomas were the only source about Jesus we possessed, we would not even learn that Jesus had a reputation for doing miracles, for even that goes without mention. It is self-evident that these peculiarities in Thomas are due to the gnostic prejudices of its compilers. Even if his sources did contain miracle stories or accounts of Jesus' other deeds, he would not have been interested in them, for his one abiding purpose was quite clearly to present

---

divided the material into sayings on his own and produced thereby a considerable amount of confusion for the reader who is trying to compare various opinions on a particular saying. An excellent aid in solving this dilemma is provided in a chart given by R. McL. Wilson, Studies, pp. 157-158.

Jesus as the gnostic redeemer.[15] In his eyes, the reports of Jesus' actions must have been completely devoid of meaning. He was concerned not with the deeds of Jesus but with his words, for these words contained for him (and for others) the secret message which could release the gnostic from spiritual death.

Still another dissimilarity, though one closely related to what has just been said, comes with regard to the titles given Jesus by the Synoptic Gospels and by Thomas. Titles frequently used in the Synoptics, such as Messiah, Christ and Lord are conspicuously absent in the Gospel of Thomas. On the contrary, Saying 13, which is certainly a reworking of the Christological confession of Peter, goes to great lengths to discredit both Peter and his confession. Nor is Jesus thought of as the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. Only once (Saying 54) are the prophets of Judaism mentioned, and at that point they are specifically repudiated by Jesus with these words: "You have dismissed the Living One who is before you and you have spoken about the dead." In Thomas Jesus is sometimes referred to as the Living One or the Living Jesus: Occasionally he is also called the Son or the Son of Man. There seem to be no Messianic connotations to any of these for Thomas. It is also clear that Thomas is not concerned with the sinfulness of mankind or about his need for redemption from sin. Outside of the two brief references to sin (Saying 14: If you fast, you will beget sin for yourselves; Saying 104: What then is the sin that I have committed?), there is no hint of the sinfulness of man or of his need for salvation from sin. The way to the "place of life" is, instead, open to those who recognize that they have come from the Light as Saying 50 says. Salvation is understood, therefore, by Thomas in a purely gnostic sense.

---

[15] That this is the intended portrayal of Jesus in Thomas is shown not only by the consistent manner in which it is drawn throughout the entire gospel, but also by the opening words and first saying of the book.

This picture of Jesus as the gnostic revealer also explains another startling difference between Thomas and the Synoptic Godpels, namely, the absence in Thomas of the entire Passion Narrative which is so central to all of the canonical Gospels. The only possible reference to the passion of Jesus occurs in the mention of a cross in Sayings 55 and 101 which are doublets of Matthew 13:37-38par. Even if Thomas' phrase "and does not take up his cross in my way" is an oblique reminder of the Crucifixion, there is nothing else in the book which even suggests a knowledge of the Passion Story.

The person who studies the relationship of Thomas to our Synoptic Gospels must also keep in mind the fact that almost half of Thomas' sayings have no parallels in our Gospels. Sayings such as Saying 50 quoted above are however extremely valuable in revealing Thomas' brand of gnosticism to us.

Even from this brief introduction it should be clear that The Gospel according to Thomas presents a complex problem to the researcher interested in its relationship to our Synoptic Gospels. It offers both startling similarities to our Gospels and striking differences from them. These facts as well as Thomas' second century origin will support a wide variety of preliminary conclusions. They may even mean that Thomas used our Gospels for some sayings and not for others. Only further and more detailed study can produce a more definitive statement of what the relationship actually is.

Previous Studies

The scholarly opinions about the relationship of Thomas' synoptic sayings, that is, those sayings in Thomas which are also found in our Synoptic Gospels, fall quite naturally into the two main possibilities mentioned above. On the one hand, a sizeable and distinguished group of scholars have published studies supporting the viewpoint that Thomas did not use our Synoptic Gospels as the sources for his synoptic sayings; on the other hand, an even larger and equally distinguished body of researchers have maintained that Thomas did indeed use our Gospels. For the sake of brevity the first viewpoint may be called the independent view, the second the dependent view. Within each of these major divisions there occurs considerable variation as to how the relationship or lack of one is to be proven, as well as some disagreement as to the nature of the relationship itself. Therefore, a brief resumé of the positions of some of the leading members of each group is in order.

Among those who have championed the view that Thomas represents a tradition separate from our Synoptic Gospels, the name of Gilles Quispel is the most prominent. As a member of the inner circle of the Nag-Hammadi scholars, Quispel was able to begin in 1957 (well before the text of Thomas was available to others) the publication of a long series of articles.[16] The thrust of these articles is that the Gospel of

---

[16] Gilles Quispel, "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament," *VC*, XI(1957), 189-207; _____"L'Evangile selon Thomas et les Clementines," *VC*, XII(1958), 181-196; _____"L'Evangile selon Thomas et le Diatessaron," *VC*, XIII(1959), 87-117; _____"Some Remarks on the Gospel of Thomas," *NTS*, V(1958/1959), 276-290; _____"L'Evangile selon Thomas et le 'Texte Oriental du noveau Testament," *VC*, XIV(1960), 204-215; _____"The Gospel According to Thomas," *Listener*, LXIII(1960), 389-390; _____"Der Heliand und das Thomasevangelium," *VC*, XVI(1962), 121-151; with K. H. Rengstorf, "Die Stadt der Mörder (Matthew 22:7)," in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche; Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*, ed. W. Eltester ("Beiheft zur

Thomas represents an ancient Jewish-Christian tradition of the sayings of Jesus (probably Palestinian in origin). Quispel attempts to link this independent tradition with the Gospel of the Hebrews (the content of which is known only from seven small quotations in other writings) and maintains that this Jewish-Christian Gospel, the Gospel of Hebrews, was a fifth source for Tatian's Diatessaron. As supporting arguments, he points out the similarities in textual variants which Thomas shares with the Pseudo-Clementine literature and with Codex Bezae (D) and the Western text family. Quispel's position is vulnerable from several different directions. His assumption of a fifth source for the Diatessaron is not widely held, nor is it at all clear that Thomas' occasional relationships to the Western text family are determinative with regard to establishing Thomas' sources. On the basis of papyri evidence (specifically Papyrus 52), Ernst Haenchen attacks Quispel's assumption that our Synoptic Gospels were unknown in second century Egypt.[17] He also demonstrates how shaky are Quispel's efforts to link Thomas with the almost non-extant Gospel of Hebrews, because that attempt is based on a non-Synoptic saying, Saying 2. Although Haenchen subjects Quispel's position to this severe criticism, he also ascribes (and rightly so) much value to Quispel's work:

> Quispel's contributions in seeing that the text of the second century which appears in Thomas follows along the lines of Tatian and the Pseudo-Clementine literature are indisputable.[18]

Zeitschrift für neutestament Wissenschaft," 26; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1962), pp. 106-129.

[17] Haenchen, ThR, XXVII(1961-1962), 169.

[18] Haenchen, ThR, XXVII(1961-1962), p. 168. Cf. Wilson, Studies, p. 140.

Other scholars, however, have agreed with Quispel that Thomas represents an independent tradition. Hugh Montefiori, after comparing the parables of Thomas with those in the Synoptic Gospels gave his own conclusion in these words:

> Nevertheless it is often the case that Thomas' divergencies from synoptic parallels may be most satisfactorily explained on the assumption that he was using a source distinct from the Synoptic Gospels.[19]

A. Strobel, W. C. Van Unnik and H. W. Bartsch hold the same basic opinion.[20]

Another group of researchers also agrees that Thomas represents, at least in many sayings, an independent tradition. These men differ from those mentioned above in holding that Thomas' sources were oral and not written. Three of the more prominent writers who share this opinion are J. Leipoldt, Oscar Cullmann, and R. Mcl. Wilson.[21]

While early enthusiasm led many to assertions that Thomas must represent an independent tradition, a few writers were more hesitant about making such a conclusion until more study had been done. H.-Ch. Puech, for example, writing in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, says only that Thomas' independence from the Synoptic Gospels is a possibility.[22] At the time of its writing this answer was probably the best that could be given to the question of Thomas' sources. H. E. W. Turner also adopted this "wait and see" role. He noted, however, that he felt that the weight of the argument would be against Quispel's view for some time.[23]

---

[19] Hugh Montefiori, "A Comparison of the Parables of the Gospel according to Thomas and of the Synoptic Gospels," Thomas and the Evangelists (London: SCM press, 1962), p. 78.

[20] A. Strobel, "Textgeschichtliches zum Thomas Logion 86," VC, XVII(1963), 211-224; W. C. Van Unnik, Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings, ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 30; Naperville, Ill.; Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1960; H. W. Bartsch, "Das Thomasevangelium und die Synoptischen Evangelien," NTS, IX(1960), 249-261.

[21] J. Leipoldt, "Ein neues Evangelium?" ThLZ, LXXXIII(1958), 481-496; O. Cullmann, "Das Thomasevangelium und die Frage nach dem Alter in ihm enthaltenen Tradition," ThLZ, LXXXV(1960), 321-334; R. Mcl. Wilson, Studies.

[22] H.-Ch. Puech, "Thomas" in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, p. 239.

A very large number of scholars have come to support the view that Thomas used our Synoptic Gospels as his sources.[24] Among the first to hold this view were the American scholars R. M. Grant and D. N. Freedman.[25] After surveying the gnostic milieu out of which Thomas is said to have arisen, Grant-Freedman come to the conclusion that Thomas' synoptic sayings are examples of the same type of exegesis which the Latin Church Father Hippolytus attributed to the Naassene gnostics (Refutations, V). These gnostics according to Grant-Freedman accomplished their exegesis by the interweaving of several Synoptic passages (usually ones drawn from completely different contexts) or by rearranging the sequences of the sayings. Saying 14, they say, provides an example of both types of exegesis: The introductory questions reverse the order in which alms, prayer and fasting occur in Matthew 6; the remainder of the saying is composed by interweaving Luke 10:8-9 and Matthew 15:11. However, closer examination of Saying 14 (below) shows that Thomas' text cannot be so easily explained and that such combinations by themselves do not say anything about the sources from which Thomas may have drawn them. Haenchen opposes the Grant-Freedman position from an even more basic point of view.[26] Since Thomas is totally unconcerned with the main Naassene doctrine of the Urmensch and with the speculative mythology connected with the Urmensch idea, he concludes quite correctly that Thomas could hardly have been created by the Naassenes.

---

[23] H. E. W. Turner, "The Gospel of Thomas: Its History, Transmission and Sources," in Thomas and the Evangelists (London: SCM Press, 1962).

[24] Among those whom we shall mention here only are the following: Jean Doresse, Les livre secrets des gnostiques d'Egypt (Paris: Plon, 1958); _____ L'Évangile selon Thomas (Paris: Plon, 1959); J. B. Bauer, "Echte Jesusworte?" in W. C. Van Unnik, Evangelien aus den Nilsand Gärtner, The Theology of the Gospel According to Thomas, trans. E. J. Sharp (New York: Harper & Bros., 1961); W. R. Schoedel, "Naassene Themes in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas," VC, XIV(1960), 225-234; H. Schürmann, "Das Thomasevangelium und das lukanische Sondergut," Biblische Zeitschrift, VII(1963), 236-260; E. Kasser, L'Évangile selon Thomas (Bibliothèque Théologique; Neuchatel, Switzerland: Éditions Delachaux & Niestle, 1961).

[25] R. M. Grant and D. N. Freedman, The Secret Sayings of Jesus (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1960).

A more convincing argument for the secondary nature of Thomas as a user for the Synoptic tradition is made by Ernst Haenchen.[27] The main direction of Haenchen's position is the attempt to understand the gnostic character of Thomas. Such an understanding, he feels, provides the only suitable basis for explaining the selection of Synoptic sayings by Thomas as well as the text itself. He finds three themes around which the sayings center: one, the material world is evil; two, the enlightening news brought by Jesus to the elect, namely that they are in essence divine; three, the proper gnostic life is one of abstinence from the world.[28] This part of Haenchen's work is of extremely great value, and his conclusions about the gnostic meaning of the sayings remain as the starting point for all future discussions of Thomas. It is also true that the gnostic viewpoint of Thomas' compiler (or compilers) was a chief factor in the choice of sayings which we find in the Gospel of Thomas. Haenchen's contention, however, that the gnostic alterations of the individual sayings themselves show a use of our Synoptic Gospels (albeit in an oral remembrance of them) is not born out by a detailed analysis of the texts. In a vast majority of the sayings of Thomas there is no gnostic reason whatsoever which explains why Thomas would have preferred one reading over another. Other methods are needed in order to make a judgment about the sources used by Thomas.

---

[26] E. Haenchen, ThR, XXVII(1961-1962), 169-172; 318-319; E. Haenchen, Die Botschaft des Thomas-Evangeliums (Theologische Bibliothek, 6; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1961), pp. 9-10.

[27] If Thomas originated in Syria as most everyone agrees, then it seems to me that both Quispel's and Haenchen's arguments are largely irrelevant. Tatian's Diatessaron is evidence that they were known in Syria in time to have been used by Thomas.

[28] Haenchen, Botschaft, pp. 11f.

The most significant study of the relationship between Thomas and our Gospels is that of Wolfgang Schrage, Das Verhältnis des Thomas-Evangeliums zur synoptischen Tradition und zu den koptischen Evangelienübersetzungen.[29] Schrage correctly sees that the earlier writers on this problem were too eager to conclude that Thomas presented us with extra-canonical and pre-canonical material. He is also correct in stating that the question can only be decided on the basis of the form critical and redactional evidence provided by an analysis of each individual saying. He finds, however, that such evidence is inconclusive for many sayings and that a further method of study is needed. For this added step he turns to a textual critical comparison of Thomas' text and those presented by the Coptic versions of the New Testament. As his sources for the latter he concentrates chiefly on the Coptic New Testaments as edited by G. Horner, although he makes reference to other fragments when they come to bear on the problem. Finally, he concludes the analysis of each saying with a discussion of its gnostic meaning. Schrage's book is, thus, an extremely valuable contribution to the studies of Thomas. In it he has clearly delineated the nature of the problem itself and the kinds of methods necessary for its solution. His analysis of Thomas' relationships with the various Coptic versions opens up another area for the textual critic and will perhaps require another reevaluation of the Coptic versions as sources for the text of the New Testament. Furthermore, he has made a significant advance toward the understanding of Thomas as a gnostic book. His collection of gnostic parallels as well as his insights into the sayings are important contributions.

---

[29] Wolfgang Schrage, Das Verhältnis des Thomas-Evangeliums zur synoptischen Tradition und zu den koptischen Evangeliensübersetzungen (Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche," 29; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964).

In spite of the general value of Schrage's monograph, his misunderstanding of the form critical and the redactional approaches has led him to an incorrect analysis of the sayings and to the incorrect conclusion that such methods prove Thomas' use of our Synoptic Gospels. His basic error lies in the misunderstanding of what editorial traces are. Whenever he can show that Thomas' text appears to be a mixture of the textual readings of Matthew and Luke (Mark, too, occasionally), he is certain to claim some of the readings as redactional traces. Saying 16, for example, witnesses to the Matthean readings "to cast" and "sword" (Matthew 10:34-36) and to the Lukan readings "think," "divisions," and "father...son," "son...father." These readings supposedly prove Thomas' use of both Matthew and Luke. None of these words, however, can with any confidence be traced to the editorial work of either Synoptic Evangelist. In order to call a reading a redactional trace, one must be able to attribute that reading to a particular evangelist's theological intent, such as the example given above of Matthew's concern with the concept of righteousness. Schrage's understanding of the nature of editorial traces permits him to conclude Thomas' dependence on our Gospels prematurely. He is thus able to dismiss with one paragraph in his Introduction the extremely important redactional issue regarding the order of the sayings in Thomas, an order which shows no relationship to the work of the Synoptic Evangelists. With regard to form critical arguments Schrage shows that many of Thomas' sayings reveal signs of secondary development beyond the Synoptic forms of those sayings. From this observation he incorrectly assumes that Thomas must have begun with the sayings as they appeared in our Gospels. Finally, his use of the Coptic Versions as evidence for Thomas' dependence on our Gospels is a methodological fault. Even if Thomas' Coptic text does betray some of the same evidences of parallel influence shown by the Coptic Versions, this fact tells us only about later influences on the Coptic translation of Thomas. It certainly tells us nothing about the Greek sources of the Greek text of Thomas. Because of these serious methodological errors Schrage's major conclusion that Thomas is dependent on our Gospels cannot be maintained.

The Present Study

In the study of the relationship between Thomas and the Synoptic tradition, the pendulum now seems to have swung completely from one side to the other. The emphasis of the first studies was on the possibility that Thomas was independent from our Synoptic Gospels; today, the weight of opinion has shifted to the view that Thomas is dependent upon them. Schrage's work, however, was the first comprehensive attempt to deal with the problem. The present study was in its beginning stages when that book was published, although the methodology of this study had already been worked out. This dissertation had been begun for many of the same reasons that motivated Schrage's work. The most important reason had been the failure of previous investigators to employ the tools of Formgeschichte and Redaktionsgeschichte to the problem. Since Schrage's understanding of those tools was considerably different, this study was continued even after the appearance of his book. The understanding of a redactional trace accepted by this study is that given above in the criticism of Schrage's work, namely, that it must be traceable to the intention of the Evangelist.

The single question which is addressed in the following pages is simply stated: Is there form critical and redactional evidence which supports the conclusion that Thomas must have obtained his synoptic sayings from our Synoptic Gospels? Such evidence would include such things as the further development of a situation created by one of the Synoptic Evangelists, the use of sayings in the order given them by an evangelist, the presence of the favorite expressions or concepts of an evangelist.

The same method of analysis has been applied to each saying: The analysis opens with a discussion of the Synoptic passage(s) based on the studies of the form critics and the redactional school. The secondary sources for this part of the study have been consciously limited to a few major works and a sprinkling of commentaries for reasons of space and time. Next, texts of Thomas and the Synoptic passages in question have been placed side by side, compared and contrasted.[30]

---

[30] These comparisons are located at the conclusion of each chapter.

This is followed in turn by a report of how the saying has been previously regarded by other writers on Thomas. Each section then is concluded by the opinion of this writer based on this study.

Note. My enumeration for the Oxyrhynchus Papyri is that of *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, ed. Kurt Aland (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964).

CHAPTER I

THE REJECTION AT NAZARETH

Matthew 13:53-58, Mark 6:1-6, Luke 4:16-30
and Saying 31a

The fact that Huck-Lietzmann felt constrained to treat this pericope twice, once in Section Ten where all three Synoptic accounts are found and once in Section One hundred and eight where only the accounts of Matthew and Mark are found, shows that these three passages are not exactly parallel to each other. The nature of their relationship to one another and to Pap. Ox. 1 which contains still another form of the Saying of Mark 6:4par has been variously treated by form critics.

Bultmann holds that Pap. Ox. 1, 5 which reads, "A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, nor does a physician heal those who know him," is more likely original when compared with the saying in Mark 6:4-5. The original statement is that Jesus could do no miracle in his home town. Such sayings were commonplace in the ancient world.[1] Mark has qualified it even further to read that he did not do many mighty works there. The Lukan pericope (Luke 4:16-30) has been created on the basis of Mark 6:1-6 to provide a setting for vv. 25-27 which come from his special tradition. Luke 4:24 may be gloss, but it is not to be regarded as Marcan material.[2]

---

[1] Bultmann, History, n. 2, p. 31; Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke (The International Critical Commentary"; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), p. 126. Bultmann's Pap. Ox. 1, 5 is equivalent to Pap. Ox. 1, 6.

Dibelius' original position was similar to Bultmann's, namely, that Mark 6:1-6 was created out of the saying contained in Pap. Ox. 1. His later opinion is that Mark's account contains too much other material for that to be so and that the original saying out of which the Marcan pericope was created was somewhat similar to the Pap. Ox. 1 saying. Luke's account has an entirely different motif than does that of Mark, that of self-help. In v. 23 the proverb "Physician, heal yourself" is quoted and in vv. 28-30 that is what Jesus does when he saves himself from the wrath of the crowd.[3]

K. L. Schmidt holds the view opposed by Bultmann that the Marcan and Lukan accounts represent two separate visits of Jesus. The Lukan account is constructed around the Isaiah prophecy given in Luke 4:18-19. Luke 4:24 was most likely a frequently quoted word of Jesus which was also known to Luke and which he added to the pericope.[4]

Thomas Saying 31 reads:

> Jesus said: A prophet is not acceptable in his own village,
> a physician does not usually heal those who know him.

Wolfgang Schrage's analysis of Saying 31 leads him to the conclusion that in this saying Thomas represents a mixed text, that is, a text which has agreements with more than one of our Synoptic Gospels.[5] He finds that Thomas has agreements with both Mark and Luke. The most decisive agreement in his opinion is the support by Thomas of the Lukan reading of δεκτός by the Coptic word ϣⲏⲡ. This δεκτός, he says, is clearly due to the redactional work of Luke. Thomas also agrees with Luke in omitting Mark's εἰ μή and the two καὶ ἐν phrases found in Mark. On the other hand, Thomas agrees with Mark and Matthew's reading of οὐκ ἔστιν at the beginning of the saying.

---

[2] Bultmann, History, pp. 31-32, n. 1, p. 32.

[3] Martin Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums (4th Auflage; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1961), pp. 106-107.

[4] K. L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964), pp. 38-41, 152-162.

[5] Wolfgang Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 75-77.

This analysis of agreements and disagreements by Schrage is correct, but his conclusion that they prove Thomas' use of Mark and Luke to form a mixed text is not convincing. His error lies in regarding the second half of Saying 31 as a secondary expansion of Mark 6:5.[6] Because he does so, he completely disregards its evidence. It is clear from Bultmann's argument, however, that it is Mark 6:5, not Pap. Ox. 1, 5 (Thomas 31), which is the secondary form of the saying. Thus, Pap. Ox. 1, 5 (Thomas 31) could not have been derived from a combination of Luke 4:24 and Mark 6:5; rather, they represent one form of a widely circulated saying of Jesus. The supposed agreement with the δεκτός in the Lukan text has two possible explanations. One, it may be a coincidence which occurred when Luke corrected Mark 6:4 to make it agree with his Isaiah quotation in vv. 18-19. Two, Luke may have known a saying something like Pap. Ox. 1, 5 (Thomas 31) and preferred it over the Marcan text because of its agreement with the Isaiah quote. Thus, the agreement of Saying 31 with this one word does not prove Thomas' use of Luke.

---

[6] Cf. Joachim Jeremias, *Unbekannte Jesusworte* ("Dritte, unter Mitwirkung von Otfried Hofius völlig bearbeitete Auflage; Gütersloher Verlaghaus Gerd Mohn, 1963), pp. 13-15; Bartsch, *NTS*, VI(1959-1960), 251-252; Grant-Freedman, *Secret Sayings*, pp. 149-150.

Matthew 13:57-58	Mark 6:4-6	Luke 4:24	Pap. Ox. 1, 6	Thomas 31
[57]ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν	[4]καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	[24]εἶπεν δὲ	Λέγει	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅
αὐτοῖς	ὁ Ἰησοῦς	ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν	Ἰησοῦς	
οὐκ ἔστιν προ-	ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν προ-	ὅτι οὐδεὶς προ-	οὐκ ἔστιν δεκ-	ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲣⲟ
φήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ	φήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ	φήτης δεκτὸς ἐστιν	τὸς προφήτης	ⲫⲏⲧⲏⲥ ϣⲏⲡ
ἐν τῇ πατρίδι	ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ	ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ	ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.	ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉϥϯⲙⲉ
	καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγε-			
καὶ ἐν τῇ	νεῦσιν καὶ ἐν τῇ			
οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. [58]καὶ	οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. [5]καὶ			
οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ	οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ		οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ	ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲥⲟⲉⲓⲛ
δυνάμεις	ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν		θεραπείας εἰς	ⲣ̄ⲑⲉⲣⲁⲡⲉⲩⲉ
πολλὰς	δύναμιν, εἰ μὴ		τοὺς γεινώσκοντας	ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ
	ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις		αὐτόν.	ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ
	ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας			
	ἐθεράπευσεν. καὶ			
διὰ τὴν	ἐθαύμασεν διὰ τὴν			
ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.	ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.			

CHAPTER II

THE BEATITUDES

Matthew 5:3-12, Luke 6:20-23
and Sayings 54, 68, and 69

Schmidt, Dibelius, Bultmann, Manson and others all agree that Luke's account of the Beatitudes is in general more original than that of Matthew.[1] It is also generally agreed among scholars of the Synoptic Gospels that Matthew has enlarged this section of the Sermon on the Mount by the addition of the Beatitudes found in 5:4, 5:5, 5:7, 5:8, 5:9, and 5:10. Of these additional Beatitudes Bultmann believes that those of Matthew 5:5 and 5:10 are due to the work of Matthew himself.[2]

The only major dispute about this pericope which is of concern to us comes over the question of whether the second person form of the Beatitude used by Luke or the third person form used by Matthew is the more original. Luke's Beatitudes follow the form: "Blessed are you . . ., for yours is . . ." Matthew's, the form: "Blessed are the . . . , for theirs is . . ."

Bultmann feels that the third person form of Matthew is the original.[3] By listing for us the references to the New Testament's Beatitudes he shows that most of the ones we know are in the third person.[4] According to Bultmann, Luke has changed his Beatitudes to the second person so that they will agree with Luke 6:22, a saying in which the second person is the original. Luke 6:22-Matthew 5:11 is in the second person because it represents a later stage of the tradition, formed *ex eventu* to meet the threat of the persecutions which the Church was undergoing. The reference to the person of Jesus in the verse is a sign of a specific Christian tendency late in the tradition.[5] Matthew's phrase "for my sake" is in this regard more developed than Luke's "for the sake of the Son of Man."

---

[1] K. L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen, p. 113; Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte, p. 248; Bultmann, History, p. 109; T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1949), p. 47. For a contrary view, Adolf Harnack, The Sayings of Jesus, trans. J. P. Wilkinson (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), pp. 48-53.

[2] Bultmann, History, pp. 109f. For the view that they come from M, Manson, Sayings, p. 48.

M'Neile in his commentary on Matthew also says that the third person is the original form of the Beatitudes. He notes that μακάριος is a translation of the Aramaic טובי (Hebrew אשרי) which means "O the happiness of . . ." Most blessings take on a third person form naturally from such a beginning.[6] Matthew 5:11-12 is in his opinion an expansion of Matthew 5:10, one which already stood in Q.[7]

Harnack is also among those who prefer Matthew's third person form of the Beatitude. He cites Matthew 11:18—Luke 5:33 as another place at which Luke is guilty of changing Matthew's third person to a second person.[8]

---

[3] Bultmann, *History*, p. 109

[4] Bultmann, *History*, p. 109, n. 4. Cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium Matthäus*, ed. Werner Schmauch ("Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über des Neue Testament," Begrundet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer; 3rd Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 81-82.

[5] Bultmann, *History*, p. 110.

[6] A. H. M'Neile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1915), p. 50.

[7] M'Neile, *Matthew*, p. 53.

Other scholars, however, have held that the second person form used by Luke is the original form of these Beatitudes. Plummer in his commentary on Luke argues that the second person makes more sense in the intimate teacher-disciple situation described by Luke 6:20.[9] Schmidt had argued earlier that in Luke 6:20 (which seems to agree with Matthew 5:1) we have a genuine tradition.[10] If these Beatitudes were addressed originally to a small band of believers, they undoubtedly would have been phrased in the second person. Since the original Sitz im Leben of these words is not definite, however, this argument cannot be conclusive.

It is Dibelius who offers the argument which makes the originality of the second person form extremely credible.[11] He argues against the originality of the third person form because it has a wider, paraenetic scope. The Beatitudes were originally words of praise for the faithful phrased in the second person. Matthew has transformed them into words of ethical instruction by changing them into the third. Dibelius points out that the same pattern is followed in the next Matthean pericope about salt and light.

Manson also holds that the second person "is probably original here."[12] Without reference to Dibelius' argument he says that Matthew's account has been given a more edifying turn.

---

[8] Harnack, Sayings, p. 49.

[9] Plummer, Luke, p. 179.

[10] Schmidt, Der Rahmen, p. 113.

[11] Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte, pp. 247-248.

[12] Manson, Sayings, p. 47.

Bornkamm and Barth in their studies on Matthew accept Dibelius' position as their starting point for discussing the Beatitudes.[13] Barth says that the warning about the last judgment in Matthew always has the paraenetic goal of striving to do the will of God. Thus, the Beatitudes become in Matthew examples of how that will is done; they become descriptions of the "virtues which Christians should practice."[14]

Both points of view on this question of originality of form have been argued with some plausibility. However, the argument for the third person form appears to be the weaker. Although Bultmann is correct in saying that a majority of the Beatitudes in the New Testament are phrased in the third person, it does not necessarily follow that this is the original form of those Beatitudes. Their continued existence in the third person can be adequately explained as the result of the Church's use of them for paraenetic purposes.

This argument of Dibelius has its real strength in the fact that it gives us a material cause for the change of persons. A change in the use of the Beatitude (a change in its Sitz im Leben) has brought about a change in its form. Bultmann's argument of a change from third to second person for the purposes of style is lacking in this kind of a material relationship. Although a certain conclusion cannot be attained in this matter, it is our opinion that the originality of the second person is the more probable. Because of the lack of consensus of opinion, however, we shall not base any of our arguments about Thomas solely on this judgment.

---

[13] Bornkamm-Barth-Held, Überlieferung, pp. 14-15.

[14] Bornkamm-Barth-Held, Überlieferung, p. 56.

Four of the Synoptic Beatitudes have possible parallels in the Gospel According to Thomas. These parallels are Saying 54, a parallel to Luke 6:20par.; Saying 68, a parallel to Luke 6:22par.; Saying 69a claimed by some as a parallel to Matthew 5:10; and Saying 69b, a parallel to Luke 6:21par. We shall limit the discussion from this point on to these four Beatitudes.

If Thomas did learn these four Beatitudes from Matthew and Luke's account of them, it is clear that he paid little attention to the arrangement of them in those Gospels. First of all, in both of those Synoptic Gospels, and therefore presumably in Q, all the Beatitudes are placed together as one unit of sayings. If Thomas knew this unit of sayings as a unit, his reason for separating one of them, Saying 54, from the rest of the group is extremely obscure. Likewise, Thomas does not even follow the order assigned to these Beatitudes in Matthew and Luke. Even if we accept for purposes of argument the view that Saying 69a is a direct parallel to Matthew 5:10, the order of the sayings in Thomas in relation to Matthew's order is Matthew 5:3, 5:11, 5:10 and 5:6; that with Luke's order is Luke 6:20, 6:22, 6:21. Thus, Thomas' order is not that of the Synoptic Evangelists. We can only conclude that Thomas' use of these Beatitudes does not reveal a knowledge of the Synoptic order and grouping. This would seem a highly improbable event if he were using them as his sources. Unless the texts themselves show clear evidence of their editorial traits, our most logical conclusion must be that he did not use the Synoptic Gospels or Q as his sources at this point.

The different characteristics of the Beatitude contained in

Luke 6:20--Matthew 5:3 are easily distinguished. Luke 6:20 used the second person form and concludes with "the kingdom of God." Matthew 5:3 uses the third person form, adds "in the spirit" as an explanation of the word "poor," and ends with "the kingdom of heaven." Since we have decided not to count the argument about person as conclusive, only two of these characteristics may be regarded as editorial in nature. The more certain of these is the addition of "in spirit" by Matthew.[15] Less certain but generally regarded as a Matthean trait is the phrase "the kingdom of heaven."

Thomas Saying 54 reads:

> Jesus said: Blessed are you poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven.

Schrage's view of this state of affairs is that Saying 54 represents the type of mixed text found elsewhere in Thomas.[16] Although he says that the arguments about person are not conclusive for him, he evidently accepts the third person as original and ascribes Thomas' use of the second person form to his dependence on a Lukan editorial trait. He bases the remainder of his case on the reading "the kingdom of heaven," saying that Thomas must have used Matthew at this point. He shows from Luke-sa how parallel influence produced the same reading in it. Since the Luke-sa also deviates from the Greek Luke in using the third person form, it is almost certain that its text is the result of parallel influence from Matthew on Luke-sa. However, Thomas' problem is somewhat different from that of Luke-sa. Thomas uses the second person form, not the third as does Luke-sa, so that the parallel influence in Thomas, if any , extended only to one word, the substitution of "heaven" for "God." The actual problem for Thomas' text, therefore, is whether parallel influence is the only possible explanation for the appearance of "heaven" in Thomas' text.

---

[15] Cf. Isaiah 66:2 and IQM xiv, 7, IQM xi, 10, and IQM xviii, 14, from the Qumran literature.

[16] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 118-119.

Further examination reveals that there are indeed other reasons for expecting to find it here. In the first place, Thomas never uses the phrase "kingdom of God," perhaps because of a gnostic bias.[17] Therefore, even if he had taken this Beatitude only from Luke, his gnostic aversion to saying "kingdom of God" would have led him to make some kind of a change here, and the word "heaven" is a natural choice for a gnostic.[18] Secondly, it is possible that Thomas did not even have to change the text for his source. Everyone is aware of the fact that Matthew did not invent the term "kingdom of heaven" but that "heaven" was a rabbinical circumlocution for the name of God. Thus, Thomas could have learned it from any Judeo-Christian source as the only reading known. If both Thomas and Matthew do come from Syria as seems probable, it is not unlikely that they both obtained this term from a common milieu.[19] Thus, since all other evidence for parallel influence is missing, the appearance of the term "kingdom of heaven" alone, does not prove that Thomas used Matthew as one of his sources for Saying 54. The fact that the Matthean "in spirit" also is missing from the saying means that there is no evidence at all in it for Thomas' use of the Synoptic Gospels.

---

[17] The name God was often reserved by gnostics for the demi-God only: Hans Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), pp. 132-136.

[18] Cf. "Hermès Trismégiste," Corpus Hermeticum: Tome 1, Traites I-XII, texte établi par A. D. Nock, et traduit A.-J. Festugiere (2nd ed; Paris: Societe D'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1960), p. 16, where Tractate I, 26, shows that the eighth heaven is not evil. In Thomas the kingdom of heaven is synonymous with the Kingdom of the Father (Saying 114) and is the highest of levels, not one of the spheres of the Archons. As E. Haenchen, Botschaft, pp. 42ff., shows, the gnostic message of Thomas is that this kingdom is within every gnostic.

[19] For Matthew: M'Neile, Matthew, p. xxviii; E. F. Scott, The Literature of the New Testament ("Records of Civilization, Sources and

Luke 6:22—Matthew 5:11 represent two quite different versions of what is evidently the same Makarism. Luke's version uses four verbs: μισέω, ἀφορίζω, ὀνειδίζω, and ἐκβάλλω. Matthew uses only three verbs and only one of these is shared with Luke: ὀνειδίζω, διώκω, and εἶπον. Matthew also adds the participle ψευδόμενοι, while Luke adds a noun subject οἱ ἄνθρωποι for his verbs. The two ἕνεκεν phrases are important as signs of later Christian tradition. Because of the many differences between Matthew and Luke here, it would appear that their versions of Q were quite different at this point. None of the changes show any intentionality, and none can be called editorial traits.

Saying 68 of Thomas can be translated:

> Blessed are you when they hate you and persecute you, and they will not find a place where they have persecuted you.[20]

Schrage's analysis of Saying 68 shows that the saying shares μακάριοι . . . ὅταν and the second person plural form with both Evangelists, that it shares the verb διώκω and the lack of the noun subject with Matthew, and that it shares with Luke the verb μισέω.

Studies," Number XV; New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), p. 67. For Thomas: Haenchen, Botschaft, p. 8.

[20] The Harper editors give the translation as: "you will find a place where you will not be persecuted." B. M. Metzger, in Kurt Aland, Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964), p. 526, translates, "and no place will be found where you have

It is, in his opinion, another example of Thomas' mixed text.[21] He offers no explanation of why such a mixing was used.

His whole argument is unconvincing. Once again the actual agreement between Thomas and the Synoptic accounts is too slim to indicate parallel influence. Since neither of the two verbs involved can be assigned to the editorial work of Matthew or Luke, their appearance in Thomas proves nothing about Thomas' relationship to the Synoptic Gospels. Schrage's assumption that the μισέω of Luke must have come from Luke is, therefore, unproven. Mark 13:13par shows that hatred and persecution go quite naturally hand in hand. The complete absence of any other agreement with either Synoptic account of the saying as well as the absence of the Synoptic conclusion given by Luke 6:23—Matthew 5:12 indicate that Thomas did not use the Synoptic Gospels as his source for the saying.

In particular, Thomas' lack of the ἕνεκεν phrase seems especially significant. Although neither phrase is an addition of the Synoptic Evangelists, the presence of the Matthean form would probably indicate Matthew as a source for this saying. Yet, any allusion to the phrase is lacking. It might be argued that this is due to a lack of concern by Thomas for the person of Jesus, but Sayings 37, 55, 77, 82, 90, 101 and 108 show that Thomas was able to make at least some use out of similar appeals about discipleship. At the same time, Saying 86 retains the title "Son of Man" for Jesus. This lack in Thomas may well

---

not been persecuted."

[21] So also Grant-Freedman, *Secret Sayings*, p. 173; Gartner, *The Theology of the Gospel according to Thomas*, p. 249.

mean, therefore, that Thomas was not aware of this application of the saying to the person of Jesus.

The considerable differences between the two Synoptic versions of the Beatitude indicated at that point that it was known in at least two different forms. The existence of still two other versions of a similar saying in Clem Al Strom IV, 41, 3 and Thomas 68 suggest that this Beatitude was known in many forms and that it is impossible to speak of the derivation of one form from another.

Saying 69a reads:

> Jesus said: Blessed are those whom they have persecuted in their hearts; those are the ones who have known the Father in truth.

Schrage argues that this saying is a clear indication of the fact that Thomas used the Gospel of Matthew as a source, since according to Bultmann the saying is a construction of Matthew. However, an analysis of Matthew 5:10 and Saying 69a shows that they actually have only two words in common: blessed and persecuted. These words are also held in common with Saying 68. Therefore, it is not possible to argue that Saying 69a is a clear parallel to Matthew 5:10. Likewise, it is not necessary to go to Matthew 5:8 to get a parallel for the phrase "in their hearts." The "in heart" of verse 8 is not a true parallel, anyway. The phrase does come from the gnostic understanding of persecution as something that happens within the gnostic rather than something thrust upon him from the outside.[22]

More important for the matter of sources is that the truly Matthean editorial trait "for the sake of righteousness" which is in Matthew 5:10

---

[22] Haenchen, Botschaft, pp. 41ff.

is not present or alluded to in Saying 69a. If Thomas had known the phrase, he could have made the Beatitude very gnostic by substituting "knowledge," "kingdom" or some other suitable term for "righteousness." The complete lack of this predominant Matthean trait,[23] however, indicates conclusively that he was not using Matthew 5:10 at all. Finally, Saying 69a makes no reference to the "kingdom" at all, even though the same concept was used in Saying 54. Thomas' conclusion is typically gnostic as Schrage's list of parallels shows.[24] The whole saying, therefore, is not a quote of Matthew 5:10. It is a gnostic saying formed to tell about the specific kind of persecution suffered by the gnostic and about his true goal, knowledge of the Father. It could have been modeled after any Beatitude, including the one which precedes it in Thomas.

The analysis of Luke 6:21-Matthew 5:6 reveals a νῦν in Luke's text which may be an editorial addition. Matthew has again added his special concern in the words "and thirsting after righteousness." He has also added the αὐτοί as the subject of the last verb, "be filled."

All three of these bits of redactional work are lacking in Saying 69b of Thomas. It reads:

> Blessed are those who are hungry, for the belly of
> him who desires will be filled.

In spite of this lack of evidence, Schrage supports his usual position that Thomas also at this point represents a secondary form of the Synoptic accounts.

In our opinion, the fact that the editorial traits are missing is enough to establish Thomas' independence from the Synoptic tradition.

---

[23] Bornkamm-Barth-Held, *Überlieferung*, p. 98.

[24] Schrage, Das *Verhältnis*, p. 149.

This conclusion is strengthened by the use of an argument similar to the one used for part of Saying 69a, namely, that there is no allusion at this point either to Matthew's "righteousness." Again, a simple substitution would have permitted the use of any one of several gnostic key words.

Saying 69b does contain two other very interesting readings. First, we note the word ἵνα in Thomas in the position where ὅτι regularly occurs in the Synoptics. Since both words are possible translations of the Aramaic ד,[25] it is possible that Thomas has here preserved a genuine translational variant over against the texts of Matthew and Luke. The other interesting reading is found in the verb of the ἵνα clause. Both Synoptic Evangelists use a form of the verb χορτάζω; Thomas uses the rather unsophisticated "belly be filled." The same variant readings for Luke 15:16 may mean that the χορτάζω represents a typical stylistic improvement. We agree with Schrage who says that the exact source of Thomas' readings can be left open, but what seems absolutely clear is that Thomas did not obtain them from either Luke 6:21 or Matthew 5:6.

Thus, none of these four synoptic Beatitudes of Thomas reflect the editorial traits of Matthew or Luke. Only in Saying 54's "kingdom of heaven" is even the possibility of such a trait to be found. At the same time, we have found that these sayings in Thomas do not reflect a knowledge of the grouping or the order of the same Beatitudes in Luke and Matthew. Therefore, we can only conclude that Thomas was not dependent upon those Gospels for his versions of these sayings.

---

[25] M'Neile, Matthew, p. 50; Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (2nd ed; London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1957), pp. 52ff; F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. R. W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 186, section 369, 2.

Matthew 5:3	Luke 6:20	Thomas 54
Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.	Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ϩⲛⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲛⲉ ⲛϩⲏⲕⲉ ϫⲉ ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̅ ⲧⲉ ⲧ ⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲛⲙ̅ⲡⲏⲩⲉ
Matthew 5:11	**Luke 6:22**	**Thomas 68**
μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσιν καὶ εἴπωσιν πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν ψευδόμενοι ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ.	μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̅ ϩⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ϩⲟⲧⲁⲛ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛⲙⲉⲥⲧⲉ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̅ ⲛ̅ⲥⲉⲣ̅ⲇⲓⲱⲕⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̅ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲛⲟϩⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ ϩⲛ̅ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲛⲧ ⲁⲩⲇⲓⲱⲕⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̅ ϩⲣⲁï ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧϥ

Matthew 5:10		**Thomas 69a**
μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.		ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϩⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲩⲇⲓⲱⲕⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲩ ϩⲣⲁϊ ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲟⲩϩⲏⲧ ⲛⲉⲧⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ϩⲛ̅ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ
Matthew 5:6	**Luke 6:21**	**Thomas 69b**
μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται.	μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε.	ϩⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲧϩⲕⲁⲓⲉⲓⲧ ϣⲓⲛⲁ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲧⲥⲓⲟ ⲛ̅ⲑϩⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱϣ

CHAPTER III

THE SIMILIES OF SALT AND LIGHT

Matthew 5:13-16, Mark 4:21, Luke 8:16, 11:33
and Sayings 32 and 33b

The sayings about salt which we know from our canonical Gospels do not appear in The Gospel according to Thomas. Nevertheless, the fact that two of the sayings from this Matthean pericope occur almost together in Thomas raises the possibility that Matthew was being used as a source at this point. Saying 32 of Thomas parallels the saying in Matthew 5:14 about a city set on a hill, whereas Saying 33b parallels the saying in Matthew 5:15par about putting a lamp on a lampstand.

It is generally agreed that the Matthean pericope was created by Matthew out of independent Bildworte. Dibelius notes that Matthew 5:16 changes a purely metaphorical passage into a paraenetic one.[1] The saying about a city set on a hill derives its meaning from this paraenetic context, that is, if the Christian does let his light shine, it cannot be missed even as a city set on a hill cannot be missed.[2] Bultmann is quite certain that the sayings about salt, light and a city on a hill were all originally secular proverbs which Matthew has expanded through the introductory phrases "You are the salt . . . , You are the light . ."

---

[1] Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte, p. 248.

[2] Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte, p. 250, n. 3. Cf. M'Neile, Matthew, p. 56.

as well as through v. 16. The saying about a city is out of place in this context.[3] Manson agrees that the saying about a city is probably a piece of worldly wisdom.[4] He identifies Luke 11:33 as the Q form of the saying about the lampstand and as the proper position for it.[5]

Pap. Ox. 1, 7, contains a parallel to the saying about a city set on a hill. It reads:

> Jesus said: A city which is erected on the top of a high mountain and firmly established, can neither fall nor remain hidden.[6]

It expands the saying as found in Matthew 5:14b by the words "firmly established" and "cannot fall." It replaces "on a hill" with "on top of a high mountain," which may be an allusion to passages like Ezekiel 17:22 and 34:14. Of Pap. Ox. 1, 7, Bultmann wrote that it is an example of how a change could occur within the logion itself; yet, he does not imply that Pap. Ox. 1 is dependent on Matthew 5:14.[7] Jeremias holds firmly that it is an expansion of Matthew's verse.[8]

Saying 32 of Thomas reads in the same way as Pap. Ox. 1, 7:

> Jesus said: A city built on a high mountain and fortified can not fall nor can it be hidden.

Those who argue that Thomas was dependent on our Synoptic Gospels argue that Saying 32 represents a mixture of Matthew 5:14b and Matthew 7:24-25. Haenchen says that this mixing took place in oral tradition and that Saying 32 shows conclusively that "the canonical Gospels have not only been copied but also read aloud and repeated orally."[9] He says that Matthew 12:25 shows how closely associated the ideas of a house and a city were in this type of picture. Schrage agrees with this argument and adds that the differences from Matthew 5:14b are due only to the need for enhancing the saying. He notes that this was also Jülicher's view of Pap. Ox. 1.[10] Kasser comments that each part of the saying is clear when taken separately but that the combination is not clear as to its meaning.[11] Grant-Freedman say that the second part of the saying about a fortified city being unable to fall is patently false.[12]

---

[3] Bultmann, History, pp. 91f., 98, 102.

[4] Manson, Sayings, pp. 152-153. Manson, however, would ascribe the composition of the pericope to Matthew's special source M rather than to Matthew himself.

[5] Manson, Sayings, p. 92.

[6] Translation of J. Jeremias in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, pp. 109-110.

[7] Bultmann, History, p. 94.

[8] Jeremias, Unbekannte, pp. 13-14; Joachim Jeremias, Die Gleichnisse Jesu (6., neu bearbeitete Auglage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 89-91.

---

[9] Haenchen, Botschaft, p. 38, n. 11. Compare his similar statement on page 11 of the same book. These judgments of Haenchen are premature, for he assumes that the sayings which have been mixed are necessarily quotes from our Gospels. Helmut Köster, Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern ("Texte und Untersuchungen, Band 65; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), pp. 266-267; concludes that in the time of the Apostolic Fathers the living tradition, not our Gospels, was most often the source of Synoptic "quotations." Only by the time of Justin Martyr (writings c. 150-165) are our Gospels explicity quoted. Although Thomas is generally agreed to have been written about the time of Justin (Haenchen, Botschaft, p. 8), its catchword connections are evidence that at least much of it had circulated orally for some time previously. It comes, therefore, from a time in which the living tradition was still dominant, and we cannot assume that synoptic material must have come from our canonical Gospels. Only if we can find in those sayings traces of the editorial work of the evangelists can we make such a decision.

[10] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 78 and p. 78, n. 4.

[11] Kasser, L'Évangile Selon Thomas, p. 66.

[12] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 150. Against this judgment it may be said that this part of the saying is false only in absolute terms. Certainly in terms of practical wisdom--the sense in which the saying was probably used--a fortified city has a far better chance of not falling than one which lacks such protection. Thus, it is not as false as

There are a number of problems, however, which the solution offered above does not solve. In the first place, if the saying does represent the mixture of two separate sayings, it is a very strange mixture, that is, it is not simply a case in which two separate sayings have been joined together. The words taken from Matthew 7:24-25 would have to be ᾠκοδόμησεν and ἔπεσεν. If these words had simply been added to the saying as we find it in Matthew 5:14b, then the case for a mixture of verses would be much stronger. In fact, however, there is no such addition. The addition comes with words to the effect that a fortified city cannot fall. Only the οὐκ ἔπεσεν appears in the expansion. A form of the third word οἰκοδομέω does appear in Saying 32, but it appears, not as an expansion, but in the place of the participle κειμένη. These observations suggest the possibility that these words may not after all come from a common source as Matthew 7:24-25.

Further investigation reveals that these words are not out of place in this saying. They are used elsewhere in the New Testament in connection with cities. Rev. 14:8, 16:19 and 18:2 show that πίπτω can apply to cities as well as to houses. Its appearance in the expansion of the saying does not, therefore, mean that it must have come from Matthew 7. It could just as easily appear in there because it was one of the normal ways of expressing the "fall" of a city. In any case, Matthew 7 does not explain the rest of the expansion of Saying 32. The city is not built on rock instead of on sand as in Matthew 7: it is "fortified." Likewise, if the verb οἰκοδομέω were used exclusively

---

it may at first appear. We still accept it as true today, as the existence of our large peacetime military establishment shows.

of buildings, its use here of a city might be more easily explained as due to the influence of Matthew 7. However, Luke 4:29 uses the same verb not only for a city, but also for a city built on a hill. Thus, it appears that the expansion of the saying in Thomas uses words which are elsewhere applied to cities. The expansion itself is best explained, therefore, as a typical case of the secondary development of the saying.

Besides the above evidence against Thomas' use of Matthew as a source, there is the further consideration of the absence of Matthew 5:14a in Thomas. That verse "you are the light . . ." is an editorial addition of Matthew. It is also a saying which uses the favorite gnostic term "light" which Thomas makes use of in Sayings 11, 24, 33, 50, and 83. Is it likely that he would have passed up the opportunity to express his gnostic faith in these terms if he knew them from Matthew?[13] In any case, the only editorial trait in the verse is absent in Thomas and no conclusion of dependence upon Matthew can be maintained.

Therefore, there are three reasons for holding that Saying 32 is not an expansion of Matthew 5:14b. One, the expansion of the saying does not contain as a unit the words supposedly taken from Matthew 7. Two, none of the words in the expansion are used in anything but a normal way. Three, the only editorial link in the verse is missing.

The saying about putting a lamp on a lampstand is phrased differently each of the four times it occurs in our Synoptic Gospels. Only in Mark 4:21 does it have an interrogative form, however, and Bultmann feels that this is the original form of the saying.[14] Black notes that the impersonal plural verbs of Matthew 5:15 are very likely Aramaisms since the Aramaic avoids the use of the passive in the same way.[15] Luke's two versions of the saying (8:16 and 11:33) both avoid these impersonal verbs through the use of οὐδείς as a subject. M'Neile attributes this change to the editorial work of Luke, but this is not necessarily so.[16] The οὐδείς does appear to be a stylistic improvement of the impersonal verbs used by Matthew and Mark, but it is not certain that Luke himself made this improvement. A comparison of Mark 2:22par in which Mark and Luke use οὐδείς while Matthew uses the impersonal verb shows that such variations were common and that they cannot be attributed with certainty to an Evangelist. οὐδείς is not, therefore, a clearly Lukan editorial trait. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Luke 11:33 when compared with Matthew 5:15 is shown to be the representative of Q, because its reference to coming into the house alludes to the acceptance of Gentiles into the Church.[17]

---

[13] He could have used it to say, for example, "You are men of (or from) light. A city . . ."

[14] Bultmann, History, pp. 79, 87.

Saying 33b reads:

> For no one lights a lamp and puts it under a bushel, nor does he put it in a place which is hidden, but he puts it on the lampstand, so that everyone who comes in and goes out may see its light.

Those who seek to see in Thomas a text which mixes together the various Synoptic texts have many possibilities with this saying, for agreement with all four Synoptic texts of the saying can be found in one way or another. It shares with Matthew and Luke the statement form of the saying. It agrees with Luke's οὐδείς. Then, it switches to either Matthew or Mark for "under a bushel." Next, it uses as its second prepositional phrase "in a place which is hidden," a reading which is probably a mistranslation of "in a cellar" found in Luke 11:33. The ἀλλά agrees with both Matthew and Luke, but the repetition of the verb τίθημι can only come from Luke 8 or from Mark 4. The singular of the third person is peculiar to Thomas, however. The prepositional phrase "on the lampstand" agrees with all the Synoptic versions except Luke 8.[18] The final ἵνα clauses agree with Luke. This type of analysis convinces Schrage and others that Thomas represents a mixing of the Synoptic texts.[19]

---

[15] Black, *Aramaic Approach*, p. 91. Cf. M'Neile, *Matthew*, p. 56.

[16] M'Neile, *Matthew*, p. 56.

[17] Manson, *Sayings*, p. 93.

The text of Saying 33b is not a mixture, however, as closer analysis shows. It is, rather, somewhat similar to the text of the saying that we already knew in Luke 11:33 and not really closely related at all to any of the other texts from the Synoptic Gospels. In Thomas the order of the two prepositional phrases about a bushel and a hidden place is simply the reverse of their order in Luke 11. The only other differences are the addition of the additional "he places" and the secondary expansion of the final clause with the words "and go out." On the basis of this second analysis it is clear that Thomas' Saying 33b represents a more developed form of this saying than does Luke 11:33. This fact by itself does not prove a dependency on Luke, however. Since none of the Lukan readings can be definitely established as Lukan editorial traits, there is no editorial basis for such a conclusion. Thomas' agreement with *οὐδείς*, for example, could represent an agreement with Q or an independent correction of the Marcan source as well as the text of Luke. It is not, therefore, editorial proof that Luke's Gospel was the source of Saying 33b for Thomas. The agreements between Thomas and the *Liege Diatessaron* show that such readings are likely to occur in different times and different places.[20]

---

[18] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, pp. 82-83, is in error here in listing this disagreement as being with Luke 11.

[19] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, pp. 81-85; Kasser, *L'Évangile selon Thomas*, pp. 66-67; Grant-Freedman, *Secret Sayings*, pp. 150-151.

Besides the above arguments, the further consideration of order favors the view that Thomas was not using our Gospels for either Saying 32 or 33. If we assume for a moment that Saying 32 came from Matthew, then we have every right to expect that Saying 33b is in its present place in Thomas because Matthew related the two sayings. As Wilson has pointed out, this is not the case. If Saying 33b does agree with Matthew or Luke, it does not agree with Matthew 5:15 but with Luke.[21] Thus, the order of Sayings 32 and 33 is not due to the Matthean order.

---

[20] Cf. Gilles Quispel, "Some Remarks on the Gospel of Thomas," *NTS*, V(1959), 285.

[21] Wilson, *Studies*, p. 75.

Matthew 5:14			Pap. Ox. 1, 7	Thomas 32
Ὑμεῖς ἔστε τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. οὐ δύ- ναται πόλις κρυβῆ- ἐπάνω ὄρους κειμένη			λέγει Ἰησοῦς πόλις οἰκοδομημένη ἐπ' ἄκρον ὄρους ὑψη- λοῦς καὶ ἐστηριγμένη οὔτε πεσεῖν δύναται οὐδὲ κρυβῆναι.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲡⲟⲗⲓⲥ ⲉⲩⲕⲱⲧ ⲙ̄ ⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲓϫⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϥϫⲟⲥⲉ ⲉⲥⲧⲁϫⲣⲏⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ ϭⲟⲙ ⲛⲥϩⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲥⲛⲁϣ ϩⲱⲡ ⲁⲛ.
Matthew 5:15	**Mark 4:21**	**Luke 8:16**	**Luke 11:33**	**Thomas 33b**
οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.	καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐκ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ;	οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἅψας κα- λύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθησιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσ- πορευόμενοι βλέπ- ωσιν τὸ φῶς.	οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἅψας εἰς κρύπτην τίθησιν οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσ- πορευόμενοι τὸ φέγγος βλέπωσιν.	ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ Ⲅⲁⲣ ϫⲉⲣⲉ ϩⲏⲃⲥ ⲛ̄ϥ ⲕⲁⲁϥ ϩⲁ ⲙⲁⲁϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ⲙⲁϥⲕⲁⲁϥ ϩⲙ̄ ⲙⲁ ⲉϥϩⲏⲧ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉϣⲁⲣⲉϥⲕⲁⲁϥ ϩⲓϫⲛ̄ ⲧⲗⲩⲭⲛⲓⲁ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲟⲩ ⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲡⲉϥⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ

CHAPTER IV

ON ALMSGIVING, PRAYER AND FASTING

Matthew 6:1-18 and Saying 62b

Bultmann feels that verses 1-8 with the exception of part of verse 1 were already connected together before it came into Matthew's hands.[1] The entire pericope is divided into four sections, vv. 2-4, 5-6, 7-13, 16-18, each of which exhibits "an antithetical scheme of opposing the right line of conduct to the wrong."[2] Dibelius also attributes some of this pericope to the tradition. Matthew 6:2ff represents "an amplified command."[3]

G. Barth points out that verse 1, Matthew's introduction, relates the pericope to Matthew's favorite concept of δικαιοσύνη.[4] Manson, after noting the possible meanings of righteousness, concludes that in its present context it could only refer to some kind of a work of piety. With regard to verse 3, "But when you give alms, do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing," he mentions that among the Arabs the relationship of the right to the left hand is symbolic of the closest fellowship. The meaning of the saying is to keep one's charitable gifts a secret from even his closest friends.[5] Bernhard Weiss says almost the same thing in his commentary: "and the saying . . . is only a proverbial expression for the fact that one should keep his good deeds secret from his neighbors."[6] M'Neile advises also that verse 3 is merely a figurative description of secrecy.[7]

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 325.

[2] Bultmann, History, pp. 132-133.

[3] Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte, p. 247.

[4] Bornkamm-Barth-Held, Überlieferung, p. 130.

Grant-Freedman refer parts of Sayings 6 and 14 to this Matthean pericope. Saying 6a (plate 81, 15-18) reads:

> His disciples asked him, they said to him: "Do you want us to fast, and how should we pray, and should we give alms and what diet should we observe?"

Saying 14a (plate 83, 14-19) appears to answer:

> Jesus said to them: When you fast, you will beget sin for yourselves, and when you pray, they will condemn you, and when you give alms, you will do evil to your spirits.

Grant, observing that the order of these three actions is the reverse order of their appearance in Matthew 6:1-18, feels that what we have here in Thomas is another example of Naassene exegesis which was fond of confusing the Synoptic order in this way.[8] Unfortunately Schrage makes no reference to these possible dependencies on the New Testament. This silence would seem to mean that he rejects them as possibilities. However, this conclusion may not be valid since in his discussion of Saying 62 he mentions Saying 104 which speaks only of prayer and fasting as an example of Thomas' rejection of almsgiving.[9] That kind of an identification could only be made on the basis of Matthew 6:1-18. Thus, his silence over Sayings 6 and 14 is puzzling.

---

[5] Manson, Sayings, pp. 164-165.

[6] Bernhard Weiss, Das Matthäusevangelium (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1876), p. 178.

[7] M'Neile, Matthew, p. 74.

[8] R. M. Grant, "Notes on the Gospel of Thomas," Vigiliae Christiani XIII(1959), 176.

Since the three concepts of almsgiving, prayer and fasting are connected together in the New Testament only in Matthew 6:1-18, one possible explanation of their conjunction in Thomas is that it is due to Thomas' use of Matthew. In order to hold this view, however, one ought to be able to present more evidence than the mere conjunction of these three practices, since they were already connected in Matthew's source. Grant evidently makes no distinction between the use of Matthew or of Matthew's source. In fact, the absence of the only Matthean trait, the use of the word "righteousness," would have to be cited in favor of the use of Matthew's source if there were only two alternatives.

There are several arguments for a third alternative, namely that Thomas' tradition of this trio of ideas was independent from Matthew 6:1-18 and from Matthew's source. In Thomas the issues of fasting, etc., are raised by the questions of Jesus' disciples. According to Bultmann the interrogative form, even when the questions come from the disciples as a group rather than from opponents, is an earlier form than a statement form.[10] Thomas' form of these sayings, therefore, appears to represent an older stage in the tradition than does that of Matthew 6:1-18.

The second argument which supports Thomas' independence is one of order. Thomas' arrangement of all the sayings supposedly derived from Matthew 6 or its source shows no recognition of its order except in the conjunction of the three works of merit. Saying 62, which will be discussed next, is also considered by many to have been derived from this pericope. If so, however, it is difficult to explain why Saying 62 is so far removed from the others. Since almsgiving is denied as worthwhile in Thomas, we need not expect to find Saying 62 used of almsgiving, as Schrage also says.[11] Since that saying would, however, connotate almsgiving to anyone familiar with Matthew, we should still expect to find that Thomas would use it somewhere near his denials of almsgiving. Its complete dissociation from them suggests that Thomas did not know Saying 62 in its connection with almsgiving and, therefore, that he knew neither Matthew 6 nor its source. The fact that a fourth practice not from Matthew 6 is also a part of Sayings 6 and 14 further suggests that the conjunction of these ideas in Thomas is not due to Matthew 6 at all but to the fact that Thomas wished to deny four of the major observances of the non-gnostic Christians.

---

[9] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 130.

[10] Bultmann, History, pp. 66-67, 333.

Besides betraying no knowledge of Matthew 6 or its source's order, Thomas actually uses these three sayings in an order all his own. Saying 6 is joined with Saying 5 by the catchword "reveal" (plate 81, 13 and 22) and with Saying 7 by "eat" (plate 81, 18 and 25). Saying 14 is joined with Saying 13 by "mouth" (plate 83, 3 and 25), and with Saying 14 by ⲣⲟ "mouth" (plate 83, 25) and ϩⲟ "face" (plate 83, 30). Saying 62 is connected with Saying 61 by ϫⲱ (plate 91, 31 and 35). Such connections indicate that Thomas was using a source other than Matthew 6.[12]

---

[11] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, p. 130.

[12] For our argument against Haenchen's contention that this shows only that our Gospels were repeated orally, see above n. 9, p. 42.

Saying 62 reads:

> I tell my mysteries to those worthy of my mysteries. What your right hand will do, do not let your left hand know what it does.

Thomas' version of the saying contains some obvious differences from Matthew's. Thomas uses the τί clause twice, once at the beginning and once at the end of the saying. An even more significant difference is the use of the future tense in the first such clause.[13]

Schrage notes these differences as well as some between the sahidic Coptic and Thomas, but he nevertheless holds to his belief that Saying 62 should be dependent on Matthew. He does admit that this saying by itself gives no support to the overall argument.[14]

The reduplication of the clauses is an indication that the saying itself had been passed on by oral tradition. Whether the saying which has been reduplicated must have come from Matthew 6 is doubtful. The arguments about order given above apply here, too, as do those about catchword connections. It is surprising that the future tense ⲛⲁⲁϥ is not accorded any significance by Schrage or the others. He says simply "the first ποιεῖ is translated as future."[15] How can we assume that a ποιεῖ was the Greek reading? It is true that the third future tense in Coptic is often used to translate Greek verbs which indicate possibility,[16] but we are dealing with a first future tense. It is necessary, therefore, to assume a Greek ποιήσει rather than ποιεῖ. Since the imperfect tense of the Aramaic may be translated either way,[17] the ποιήσει may very well represent a different translation of the saying than was known to Matthew.

---

[13] Kasser, L'Evangile selon Thomas, p. 88, translates the clause only once and then in the present tense.

[14] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 130.

[15] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 130.

[16] W. C. Till, Koptische Grammatik (2. Auflage; Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1961), p. 156, section 308.

Since neither the editorial traits nor the order of Matthew's pericope is betrayed by Thomas, it is not possible to assume that he was using Matthew as a source at this point. The fact that Thomas employs a different method of ordering the sayings strengthens that belief, and the possibility that the ποιήσει of Saying 62 represents a translation variant from the Aramaic adds even further to its probability. The evidence does not support the use of Matthew, but rather suggests an independent source.

---

[17] Franz Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961), p. 42, section 98.

Matthew 6:3	Thomas 62b
μὴ γνώτω ἡ ἀριστερά σου τί ποιεῖ ἡ δεξιά σου	ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲧⲉⲕⲟⲩⲛⲁⲙ ⲛⲁⲁϥ ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉⲧⲉⲕϩⲃⲟⲩⲣ ⲉⲓⲙⲉ ϫⲉ ⲉⲥⲣ ⲟⲩ

CHAPTER V

ON TREASURES

Matthew 6:19-21, Luke 12:33-34 and Saying 76b

This pericope exemplifies the enlargement of a mashal-type saying through the use of an illustration.[1] The main saying is supplied in almost similar texts by Matthew 6:21 and Luke 12:34: "For where your treasure is, there your heart will also be." Matthew's introductory material in antithetical form "Do not lay up treasures . . . but lay up treasures in heaven" represents a more original form of the sayings than does Luke's purely positive version "Provide for yourselves . . . treasures . . . ."[2]

B. Weiss felt that the Lukan version of the saying resulted from Luke's alteration of his source under the influence of Mark 10:21: "Go, sell what you have and give (it) to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven."[3] According to Weiss, Luke has made Jesus' demand of one rich man into a general rule. As he points out, the stress on the imperishability of heaven's treasure in the Lukan version is hardly understandable without assuming a prior stress on the perishable nature of earthly treasures. The *ἀνέκλειπτον* is a *hapax legomenon*. Weiss' arguement, however, serves only to show that the form of the saying preserved by Luke is further from the original than that preserved by Matthew. The only wording that can be confidently attributed to Luke himself is the use of βαλλάντια for purse. Only Luke among the New Testament writers uses it (Luke 10:9, 22:35, 36).

---

[1] Bultmann, *History*, pp. 82, 84.

[2] M'Neile, *Matthew*, pp. 83-84. Cf. Bultmann, *History*, pp. 327-328; Manson, *Sayings*, p. 172.

[3] B. Weiss, *Matthäusevangelium*, pp. 193-194.

The translation of the word βρῶσις in the Matthean version has presented some difficulty since early times. Because of its relationship to βρῶμα "food" it ought to refer in some way to eating, but its usual translation has been "rust". Mal. 3:11 LXX, however, uses it to translate אֹכֵל "devourer" in a passage where it may refer to a grasshopper or a wood worm.[4] Klostermann accepts "Wurm" as the translation of βρῶσις for his commentary,[5] and in English the RSV offers "worm" as an alternate translation for rust although it uses "rust" in the text itself. The translation "worm" is also supported by the oldest Latin MSS (k, Cyptr. test. III,1: de opere et eleem. 7) which read comestura "devourer" instead of aerugo "rust."[6] Rust, therefore, would seem to be a misunderstanding. Precious metals do not rust but are lost to the thieves mentioned also in the verse. Other treasures, especially stored food and grain, are subject to being devoured by various types of insects.

Saying 76b of Thomas reads:

---

[4] Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, trans. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959), p. 147.

[5] Erich Klostermann, Das Matthäusevangelium, Vol 4 of Handbuch zum neuen Testament, ed. Hans Lietzmann (Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1927), p. 60.

[6] B. Weiss, Matthäusevangelium, p. 290.

> You also seek for yourselves his treasure which does not fail, which endures, the place where the moth does not come near to devour nor the worm to destroy.

Saying 76b, which Thomas uses as a conclusion to the Parable of the Pearl of Great Price, parallels the verses which introduce the saying about heart and treasure in the canonical passages. Grant,[7] Schrage,[8] and others feel that these words were added to the parable by Thomas because they contain the word treasure which occurs in Matthew 13 in the Parable of the Hidden Treasure, the parable which immediately precedes the Parable of the Pearl. The evidence does not support their conclusion. As Wilson notes, there is nothing in Thomas' Gospel to indicate that he knew of Matthew's collection of kingdom parables in Matthew 13.[9] Furthermore, if there is supposed to be a catchword connection, it would seem more likely that we would find all of Saying 76 somewhere near Saying 106 where the Parable of the Hidden Treasure does occur in Thomas.

The so-called agreements of Saying 76b with its New Testament parallels provide the same kind of picture with which we have become familiar in the previous sayings. If we suppose that Thomas used our Gospels as his sources, we also have to suppose that he switched back and forth between the Matthean and Lukan parallels for no apparent reason. The readings βρῶσις and ἀφανίζει "agree" with Matthew's version, while the singular of the word treasure, the phrase about its unfailing nature and the verb "destroy" seem to agree with Luke. Since none of these "agreements" refer to words that can be definitely attributed to either Synoptic Evangelist, they signify nothing about Thomas' source of them. It is again significant that the only certain editorial trait in the whole passage, Luke's βαλλάντια, is not found in Saying 76b. Therefore, it is not possible to prove that Thomas used our Gospels as his sources here.

---

[7] Grant, VC, XIII(1959), 178.

[8] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 159.

[9] Wilson, Studies, p. 54.

Other evidence also points to the conclusion that those Gospels were not his sources. The saying begins with the words "You also seek for yourselves . . . ," a beginning different from either Matthew or Luke's. It undoubtedly stems from the use of the saying to draw out the gnostic lesson from the parable in Saying 76a, and this is exactly the point to be observed. This introduction plus the so-called mixed nature of the text show us that Thomas was here using a familiar saying to make his gnostic point, not to make a catchword connection with the Parable of the Hidden Treasure in Matthew 13. What was this gnostic lesson? It was that everyone should seek for the same treasure which the prudent merchant in the Parable of the Pearl found for himself, namely gnosis.[10]

Secondly, if one is going to talk about the mixing of texts here, he must also include John 6:27 "but ask for the food which endures unto eternal life" as a part of the mixture.[11] What this Johanine reference actually serves to show us, however, is that the contrast between the "lastingness" of the eternal with the transitoriness of the earthly is a natural one. Such contrasts were the natural outcome or Tendenz in the transmission of a saying which pointed out the perils of earthly treasures. Thomas' use of two terms for this expression is an indication of the length of time the saying stayed in oral transmission rather than to a mixing of the canonical texts.

---

[10] Thomas' lack of the phrases "in heaven" with treasure must also be due to his beliefs about gnosis. If the kingdom is with the gnostic (Saying 3), then the gnosis must also be within him, not in heaven.

[11] Lucien Cerfaux, "Les paraboles du royaume dans l'Évangile de Thomas," Le Muséon, LXX(1957), 313.

Finally, Thomas' reading "worm" is an important one even though it is not due to Thomas. It is, in fact, a definite indication of the fact that Thomas' tradition was based on an oral tradition which understood the original meaning behind the translation βρῶσις. It is not likely that a gnostic who had set out to confuse orthodox readers by mixing the accepted texts would have originated this understanding.

Matthew 6:20	Luke 12:33	Thomas 76b
	Πωλήσατε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν	
Θησαυρίζετε	καὶ δότε ἐλεημοσύνην· ποιήσατε	ⲚⲦⲰⲦⲚ̄ ϨⲰⲦʼ
δὲ ὑμῖν	ἑαυτοῖς βαλλάντια μὴ παλαι-	ⲦⲰⲦⲚ̄ ϢⲒⲚⲈ ⲚⲤⲀ
θησαυροὺς	ούμενα, θησαυρὸν ἀνέκλειπτον	ⲠⲈϤⲈϨⲞ ⲈⲘⲀϤⲰϪⲚ̄ ⲈϤⲘⲎⲚ
ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅπου οὔτε σὴς	ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,	
οὔτε βρωσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ		ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲠⲘⲀ ⲈⲘⲀⲢⲈϪⲞⲞⲖⲈⲤ ⲦϨ
ὅπου κλέπται οὐ διορύσσουσιν	ὅπου κλέπτης οὐκ ἐγγίζει	ⲚⲞ ⲈϨⲞⲨⲚ ⲈⲘⲀⲨⲈⲞⲨⲰⲘ
οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν· ὅπου γὰρ	οὐδὲ σὴς διαφθείρει· ὅπου γὰρ	ⲞⲨⲆⲈ ⲘⲀⲢⲈϤϤⲚ̄Ⲧ ⲦⲀⲔⲞ
ἔστιν ὁ θησαυρός σου, ἐκεῖ	ἔστιν ὁ θησαυρὸς ὑμῶν, ἐκεῖ	
ἔσται καὶ ἡ καρδία σου.	καὶ ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν ἔσται.	

CHAPTER VI

THE SINGLE EYE

Matthew 6:22-33, Luke 11:34-36 and Saying 24

Saying 24 of Thomas has been translated as follows:

> His disciples said: Show us the place where Thou art, for it is necessary for us to seek it. He said to them: Whoever has ears let him hear. Within a man of light there is light and he lights the whole world. When he does not shine, there is darkness.[1]

Grant-Freedman feel that Thomas' references to the light within every gnostic are a paraphrase of Matthew 6:22-23, "the eye is the light of the body;" furthermore, they say that the part of the saying about lighting the world must go back to Matthew 5:14, "You are the light of the world."

There is no editorial evidence to support Thomas' dependence in either case. In fact, it is hard to see much resemblance at all with Matthew 6:22-23, and the second reference is actually as close to John 1:9 as to Matthew 5:14. The omission of Matthew 5:14 with Saying 32 has already been discussed as evidence for holding that Thomas did not know that Matthean pericope. Schrage does not discuss these passages.

The saying about having ears will be discussed at a later point.

---

[1] The Gospel according to Thomas, Harper edition, p. 19.

CHAPTER VII

ON CARES

Matthew 6:25-34, Luke 12:22-31 and Saying 36

This pericope is another example of how a wisdom saying was expanded with illustrative material.[1] Matthew 6:25--Luke 12:22 represents the original saying:

> Take no thought for your life, what you shall eat, neither for your body, what you shall put on. Is not life more than food and the body more than clothing?

Verses 26, 28-30 about the birds of the air and the lilies of the field were either originally independent sayings also or they were a continuation of verse 25. The rest of the passage in Bultmann's judgment is a secondary construction. Verse 34 about not being anxious over tomorrow is composed of two sayings which have many parallels outside the New Testament.

The high degree of verbal identity between the two Synoptic accounts shows us that this passage was a part of Q. Matthew 6:25--Luke 12:22, Mt. 6:27--Lk 12:25, Mt. 6:29-30--Lk. 12:27b-28 and Mt. 6:32--Lk. 12:30 have almost identical texts. Since both accounts also begin with διὰ τοῦτο, that phrase was probably also in Q.[2] Although the passage expresses the need for a trust in God's providence, there is nothing specifically Christian about this piety, as Bultmann points out correctly.[3] The eschatological urgency caused by the belief in the nearness of the Kingdom of God is definitely lacking in both Synoptic accounts. As typical wisdom sayings, these words were especially amenable to a variety of situations.

---

[1] Bultmann, *History*, pp. 82, 84, 88. Cf. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 247.

[2] M'Neile, *Matthew*, p. 86.

Thomas Saying 36 reads:

> Jesus said: Take no thought from morning until evening and from evening until morning, what it is that you should put on yourselves.

The corresponding part of Pap. Ox. 655 reads:

> Jesus said: Take no thought from morning until evening nor from evening until morning neither for your food what you shall eat, nor for your clothing what you shall put on. How much better are you than the lilies which grow but do not spin, not having clothing? Why do you also . . . ? Who could add to your age? He himself will give you your garment.[4]

In spite of the obvious lack of textual agreement between these sayings and the Synoptic Gospels, many commentators still maintain that Thomas' source for this saying in Thomas and in Pap. Ox. 655 was our Synoptic Gospels. Schrage says that the general agreement between the two comes through in spite of Thomas' compression of the saying.[5] He claims Pap. Ox. 655 as the actual proof for dependence. In neither case does he discuss specific agreements or explain the disagreements. Grant-Freedman had supported a similar position earlier.[6] Thomas' phrases about morning and evening are supposed to have been derived from

---

[3] Bultmann, History, p. 104.

[4] We have used the reconstruction offered by Kasser, L'Évangile selon Thomas, p. 68, as the basis of our translation.

[5] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 90-91.

[6] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 152.

Matthew 6:34. The shortening of the saying was probably done to remove the obvious traces of our Synoptic Gospels. Kasser says that neither Pap. Ox. 655 nor Thomas 36 are substantially different from their New Testament parallels.[7] Gärtner feels certain that the compression of the saying in the Coptic cannot be due to carelessness, since too much is omitted for that. He suggests that it may be due to Thomas' preoccupation with clothes.[8]

In their discussions of this saying a basic assumption of Schrage and the others becomes apparent: If Thomas uses some of the same sayings as the Synoptic Gospels, he must have derived them from our Gospels. Since this is an historical judgment about those Synoptic Gospels, the burden of proof ought to lie on those who make it. Yet, it is this proof that they fail to provide for us. Unless such evidence can be given, that is, evidence of the editorial work of the Evangelists, the question of dependency must at least remain open.

In Saying 36 and in Pap. Ox. 655 there is no evidence for dependence, unless one assumes that the only possible source for synoptic sayings is the Synoptic Gospels. On the contrary, a comparison of the texts reveals many readings which can best be explained by assuming that Thomas used sources other than those Gospels. Since the Coptic is much shorter, our evidence will be drawn from Pap. Ox. 655.

The reading "from evening until morning . . ." is not explained by either Matthew or Luke's text. Grant-Freedman's conjecture that it refers to the tomorrow of verse 34 is meaningless, as at least the first of these phrases obviously speaks about today. The fact that there is no hint in Thomas of the rest of verse 34 also is against their assumption. The meaning of the phrases--at least originally--is self-evident: a person's normal needs are for two changes of clothing a day, one for his waking hours, one for sleeping. Thus, the two phrases merely take each need into account. It seems most likely that they are the result of the secondary development of the saying, but some might wish to argue for their originality. What is clear is that they do not come from a reading of Matthew or Luke's version of the saying.

---

[7] Kasser, L'Évangile selon Thomas, p. 68.

[8] Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, p. 85.

There are other textual differences from the Synoptic accounts, too. Pap. Ox. 655 reads τροφῇ "food" in the place where the Synoptic Gospels have ψυχῇ "life," and στολῇ where they have σώματι "body." These might possibly have been taken over from the second half of the Synoptic verses which Pap. Ox. 655 and Thomas 36 do not give, but it is not likely that a gnostic such as Thomas would have purposely avoided the terms "food" and "life."[9] Both Synoptic Evangelists use μᾶλλον "better" to make the comparison in Matthew 6:30 par. Pap. Ox. 655 uses κρείσσοντες. Luke uses πόσῳ to introduce the comparison, Pap. Ox. 655, πολλῷ. Pap. Ox. 655 also uses ἄν plus the optative to express a wish in the place where the Synoptic writers use δύναται with an infinitive. If there were only one such variation within a saying or only a few in Thomas altogether, we might well ascribe it to free quotation. The existence of so many in this saying alone as well as in the rest of Thomas rules out free quotation as a possibility.[10]

---

[9] Saying 87 uses ψυχή and σῶμα to describe the gnostic anthropology. Saying 113 uses σάρξ and ψυχή.

[10] Cf. Wilson, Studies, p. 51.

They must, instead, be the result of the use of a different rescension of the saying than the ones known to our Synoptic evangelists from Q. Jeremias has pointed out with regard to Pap. Ox. 655 that the smoothness of the saying as well as its catchword connection with the next saying argues for the fact that this particular combination must be quite old, rather than a late summary of Matthew 6:30 par.[11]

This conclusion is strengthened by noting the completely gnostic meaning of the saying in Thomas and in Pap. Ox. 655. Schrage's collection of parallels from gnostic literature as well as Sayings 21 and 37 of Thomas make it certain that the meaning here was connected with the gnostic understanding of the body as a temporary clothing for the ψυχή.[12] It refers not to clothing but to a complete disregard for the body itself. This meaning is evident both in the conclusion offered in Pap. Ox. 655 "He himself will give you your clothing" and in the compression of the saying in Coptic so that it concerns only clothing. The saying has been completely separated from even the general Jewish piety to which Bultmann assigns it in our Gospels. This complete change in character must have involved a considerable length of time, rather than being the immediate result of the manufacture of a new saying out of existing literary sources.

Both the textual and the material evidence, therefore, do not point to a dependence on the Synoptic Gospels for Pap. Ox. 655 and for Saying 36 of Thomas. It points, rather, to another tradition as the source, one long used in gnosticizing circles.

---

[11] Jeremias, Unbekannte, p. 93.

[12] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 91.

Matthew 6:25, 26/30, 28-27	Luke 12:22, 28, 27, 25	Pap. Ox. 655	Thomas 36
[25]Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε	[22a]Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε	Λέγει Ἰησοῦς μὴ μεριμνᾶτε ἀπὸ πρωῒ ἕως ὀψὲ μήτε ἀφ' ἑσπέρας ἕως πρωῒ μήτε	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲙⲛ̅ϥⲓ ⲣⲟⲟⲩϣ ϫⲓ ϩⲧⲟⲟⲩⲉ ϣⲁ ⲣⲟⲩϩⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ϫⲓⲛ ϩⲓⲣⲟⲩϩⲉ ϣⲁ ϩⲧⲟⲟⲩⲉ
τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσησθε. οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖον ἐστιν τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος;	τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε.	τῇ τροφῇ ὑμῶν. τί φάγητε μήτε τῇ στολῇ ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσησθε.	ϫⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲁⲁϥ ϩⲓⲱⲧ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̅.
[30c]οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι;	[28c]πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι;	πολλῷ κρείσσοντες ἐστε	
[28]καὶ περὶ ἐνδύματος τί μεριμνᾶτε; καταμάθετε τὰ κρίνα τοῦ ἀγροῦ πῶς αὐξάνουσιν· οὐ κοπιῶσιν οὐδὲ νήθουσιν.	[27a]κατανοήσατε τὰ κρίνα πῶς οὔτε νήθει οὔτε ὑφαίνει·	τῶν κρίνων ἅτινα αὐξάνει οὐδὲ νήθει, μηδὲν ἔχοντα ἔνδυμα....	
τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται προσθεῖναι	[25]τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται ἐπι τὴν	τίς ἂν προσθείη ἐπὶ τὴν	

Matthew 6:27	Luke 12:25	Pap. Ox. 655	Thomas 36
ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυν ἕνα;	ἡλικίαν προσθεῖνα πῆχυν;	εἱλικίαν υμῶν; αὐτὸς δώσει ὑμῖν τὸ ἔνδυμα ὑμῶν . . .	

CHAPTER VIII

ON JUDGING

Matthew 7:3-5, Luke 6:41-42, and Saying 26

The pericope on judging contains the wisdom saying about not taking care of the log in one's own eye before attempting to take the speck out of the eye of another. According to Bultmann these verses probably represent what was originally a popular secular proverb.[1] Klostermann,[2] M'Neile[3] and Manson[4] all offer to us the texts of similar sayings from both rabbinical and classical sources. The close connections of the pericope with the theme of judging and with the saying about measures in both Matthew and Luke, as well as the existence of the particle *δέ* in both Gospels, indicate that these verses were already joined together in Q.[5]

The two Synoptic versions of the pericope have a high rate of verbal identity. The parallel passages Matthew 7:3 and Luke 6:41 have only these slight differences: Their placement of the word for beam differs; Matthew uses the possessive pronoun *σου* with the word eye, while Luke uses ἰδίῳ. Similarly, the last part of the pericope, Matthew 7:5 and Luke 6:42b, is given in almost identical texts by both Synoptic Evangelists: Once again, the position of the word for beam differs; Matthew uses the preposition "from" before eye, while Luke uses the preposition "in"; and the position of the infinitive "to cast out" may have been different in Luke as it is the last word of the saying according to MSS BP^{75} W ϕ.[6] The only significant differences between the Synoptic accounts occur in the middle part of the saying, the admonition to take the beam out of your own eye first (Matthew 7:4--Luke 6:42a): Matthew reads "Or how can you say . . . ," Luke simply "How can you . . ."; Matthew uses future tense to express the "can," Luke δύναται plus the infinitive; Matthew's conclusion begins καὶ ἰδού, Luke uses αὐτός with the nominative participle βλέπων. Since none of these differences can confidently be assigned to the editorial traits of either Synoptic Evangelist, they are most probably due to the fact that Q existed in several different recensions.[7] Actually, there is one other difference in the middle section of the pericope which may be assigned to Luke as he adds the vocative "brother" to the saying.[8]

---

[1] Bultmann, *History*, pp. 79-80, 86.

[2] Klostermann, *Matthäusevangelium*, pp. 65-66.

[3] M'Neile, *Matthew*, p. 90.

[4] Manson, *Sayings*, p. 58.

[5] Klostermann, *Matthäusevangelium*, p. 65.

---

[6] Fitzmeyer, *ThS*, XX(1959), p. 531, quotes Harnack as noting that this positioning of ἐκβαλεῖν at the end of the saying occurs only in MS B. Fitzmeyer himself evidently assumes that this is still the case and that the reading of B is not the better reading, for in his reconstruction of Pap. Ox. 1, 1 he places ἐκβαλεῖν in the same position it occupies in Matthew rather than at the end of the saying. On the basis of the MSS evidence cited above, however, it appears that the better reading is that which places the infinitive at the end of the saying.

[7] Cf. Bultmann, *History*, pp. 327-328.

[8] According to M'Neile, *Matthew*, p. 91, this vocative is nonexistent in Matthew/Mark, but occurs in Acts. A study of W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, *A Concordance to the Greek New Testament* (4th ed.; Edin-

Saying 26 of Thomas reads:

> Jesus said: The speck which is in the eye of your brother you see, but the beam which is in your eye you do not see. When you cast out the beam in your eye, then you will see clearly to cast out the speck in the eye of your brother.

The weakness of the type of textual comparison employed by Schrage as proof for a mixing of the texts is especially evident in his treatment of this saying.[9] Thomas' ⲡⲥⲟⲉⲓ (the beam) agrees with Luke's placement of τήν before the two prepositional phrases "in your eye" and "from your eye." At the same time his reading of "your eye" is supposed to agree with Matthew's σοῦ, his position of the infinitive "to cast out" with Matthew's ἐκβαλεῖν and the following phrase "from your eye" with Matthew (Luke again has "in").

The placement of ⲡⲥⲟⲉⲓ, however, is probably due to the normal Coptic word order as the two sahidic versions offered by Schrage for comparison show.[10] It can tell us nothing about the Greek text, nor can the possessive prefix ⲡⲉⲕ "your." Schrage refers us to John-sa 4:44, a Johanine reference to the saying about a prophet being without honor in his own country. The possessive pronoun ἰδίῳ is translated there into Coptic as the possessive article plus the double preposition

---

burgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), pp. 17-21, reveals that there is no other Synoptic occurrence of the form ἀδελφέ; however it does appear in Acts 21:20 and 22:13. The plural vocative form does occur very frequently in Acts. Thus, the appearance of the vocative in Luke 6:42 is almost surely an editorial addition of Luke.

[9] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 71-74.

[10] Both Matthew-sa and Luke-sa read: ⲡⲥⲟⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲧϩⲛ̄. In my experience the Coptic article is not separated from the noun in order to mark the limits of a phrase as the Greek article does in the Greek of Matthew 7:3. The substantive relative in which the article is separated from the verb stem may be the only time the Coptic article is separated from the word with which it goes. Cf. Till, Koptische Grammatik, #480, p. 236.

ⲙⲙⲓⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ. This double preposition is not in Thomas, to be sure, but it need not be for the Coptic also translates ἰδίος simply by the possessive article.[11] Thus, Thomas' ⲡⲉⲕ may refer to either the Matthean or Lukan reading, and Schrage's supposed agreement with Matthew cannot be maintained. Secondly, Thomas' Coptic can tell us very little about the position of the ἐκβαλεῖν in the Greek Thomas, especially since the Coptic Thomas has obviously been influenced by contact with the Coptic Gospels.[12] Finally, the last prepositional phrase in Thomas ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ does correspond to the ἐκ in Matthew. However, Pap. Ox. 1 reads τὸ ἐν in "agreement" with Luke. Did Thomas' Vorlage read ἐκ or ἐν? Since he could easily have changed the preposition under the influence of the ἐκ prefix on the infinitive, no definite answer can be given. Thus, none of the supposed agreements with either Matthew or Luke are definite agreements at all nor are they agreements with readings that can be assigned to the editorial work of Matthew and Luke. From these minor textual points alone one cannot show that Thomas used Matthew and Luke as his sources.

The only editorial trait, Luke's ἀδελφέ, is missing since the entire middle part of the saying does not appear in Thomas. Its absence in such a case does not necessarily support Thomas' use of an independent tradition, but its absence does leave those who claim the opposite without the only definite textual evidence to support their claim.

---

[11] Cf. John-sa 1:41: ⲡⲁⲓ ⲁϥϩⲉ ⲉⲡⲉϥⲥⲟⲛ ⲥⲓⲙⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ̄. "This man found his brother Simon first."

[12] Wolfgang Schrage, "Evangelienzitate in Oxyrhynchus-Logion und im koptischen Thomas-Evangelium," Apophoreta, Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen, eds. W. Eltester und F.H. Kettler ("Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche," 30; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964), pp. 251-267.

Schrage also builds his case for Thomas' use of the Synoptic Gospels as his sources on a form critical argument. The Synoptic saying begins with a question, Thomas' with a statement. Since the interrogative form is generally considered earlier, he concludes that Thomas' form is a secondary development. This may be so. Even if it is so, however, one cannot go on to conclude as he does that Thomas' secondary form is a development of the text of our Gospels, for this change itself tells us nothing about the source of the original text which has been changed. Also, as we have argued earlier, such form changes are largely the results of oral transmission and not of a literary development, so that the change itself argues against the use of our written Gospels, except as they may have circulated orally. Since the only editorial evidence is again missing, however, there is no proof that Thomas 26 came from the Synoptic Gospels.

Matthew 7:3-5	Luke 6:41-42	Pap. Ox. 1, 1	Thomas 26
τί δὲ	τί δὲ		ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ
βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ	βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ		ⲡϫⲏ ⲉⲧϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲃⲁⲗ
ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀ-	ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀ-		ⲙⲡⲉⲕⲥⲟⲛ ⲕⲛⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ
δελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ	δελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ δοκὸν		ⲡⲥⲟⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ
ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν	τὴν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀφθαλ-		ⲉⲧϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲉⲕⲃⲁⲗ ⲕⲛⲁⲩ
οὐ κατανοεῖς; ἢ πῶς	μῷ οὐ κατανοεῖς; πῶς		ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟϥ
ἐρεῖς τῷ ἀδελφῷ	δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ		
σου· ἄφες ἐκβάλω	σου· ἀδελφέ, ἄφες ἐκβάλω		
τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ	τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφ-		
ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ	θαλμῷ σου, αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν		
δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ	τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου δοκὸν		
σου; ὑποκριτά, ἔκ-	οὐ βλέπων; ὑποκριτά, ἔκ-		ϩⲟⲧⲁⲛ
βαλε πρῶτον ἐκ τοῦ ὀφ-	βαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν		ⲉⲕϣⲁⲛⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲡⲥⲟⲉⲓ
θαλμοῦ σου τὴν δοκόν,	ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου,		ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲉⲕⲃⲁⲗ
καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκ-	καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις	καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκ-	ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲕⲛⲁⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
βαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ	τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ	βαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν	ⲉⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲏ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ὀφθαμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ	ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ	τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελ-	ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲃⲁⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲕⲥⲟⲛ
σου.	σου ἐκβαλεῖν.	φοῦ σου.	

CHAPTER IX

ON CASTING PEARLS

Matthew 7:6 and Saying 93

Bultmann believes that this is another of the secular meshalim which were made into dominical sayings in the tradition.[1] The command is given in two lines of synonymous parallelism, the motive in a third "(hardly conveivable as two stranded.)"[2]

The original meaning of the saying is not known,[3] and even its exact meaning in Matthew is in doubt. Most commentators feel that the terms "dogs" and "swine" refer to the Gentiles. They base their judgment on rabbinic parallels and on Matthew 15:26.[4] Manson emphasizes the Jewishness of the passage in these words: "Matthew 7:6 looks very like a bit of apocalyptic Jewish exclusiveness, adopted by extreme Jewish Christians, and incorporated among the sayings of Jesus."[5] Other commentators, however, are unwilling to pin down the meaning of the saying so specifically. M'Neile identifies the Gentiles with the dogs but says the meaning is that a disciple "must, after all, exercise some discrimination (? in teaching)."[6] Klostermann argues that neither the original nor the Matthean saying meant the heathen by dogs and swine in spite of the rabbinic parallels.[7] All commentators are agreed that the phrases "what is holy" and "the pearls" refer to the costly message of the disciples. In Didache 9:5 the first part of the saying, "Do not give what is holy to the dogs," is used as justification for the exclusion of the unbaptised from the Eucharist. As the grounds for similar acts of exclusion, secrecy and mystery, the saying was evidently in wide use by both Christians and gnostics.[8]

---

[1] Bultmann, History, pp. 102-103.

[2] Bultmann, History, p. 81.

[3] Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte, p. 250, n. 2; M'Neile, Matthew, p. 91.

[4] Cf. II Peter 2:22, Rev. 22:15.

[5] Manson, Sayings, p. 174.

Thomas Saying 93 reads:

> Do not give what is holy to the dogs, lest they throw it
> on the dung heap; do not throw the pearls to the swine,
> lest they make it . . .[9]

According to Schrage's analysis Thomas' first difference with Matthew is the omission of the article on ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ (that which is holy). Thomas then adds to the saying the parallel member about the dung heap. This addition is supposed to be a remembrance of Luke 14:35 where κοπρία and βάλλω are also found together. Thomas' concluding sentence omits the μηδέ, perhaps to increase the parallelism with the first part of the sentence. He omits the "your" and the "before" in the same sentence. Schrage concludes:

---

[6] M'Neile, Matthew, p. 91. He notes also that the strange parallelism of "that which is holy" and "pearls" may have arisen from a mistaken translation of the Aramaic קדשא which could have both meanings according to different pointings.

[7] Klostermann, Matthäusevangelium, pp. 66-67.

[8] Cf. R. Resch, Agrapha; aussercanonische Schrift Fragmente (Zweite Auflage; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), pp. 108-109; Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 180; Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 186.

[9] This lacunae cannot be restored with any certainty. The Harper edition indicates that there is room for about four letters.

> Since the word belongs to Matthew's special material, which probably originally circulated freely in the oral tradition, and (since) traces of Matthean editorial work cannot be distinguished, there is nothing certain to be said about the origin of the saying.[10]

These observations are correct, the conclusion only partially correct. Since the editorial traits, if any, are indistinguishable, it is not possible to say with certainty that Thomas used our Gospel of Matthew as his source. Certainly, however, there might be other evidence which would enable one to conclude that Thomas used a source other than Matthew. The absence of editorial traits means only that the question of literary dependence must remain open until all the evidence has been considered.

Schrage goes on, however, to argue for Thomas' dependence on Matthew through his comparison of Thomas with Matthew-sa. He notes, for instance, that Matthew-sa like Thomas omits the definite article on ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ, the ὑμῖν, and the ἔμπροσθεν. These similarities are supposed to show that Thomas used Matthew as the source of the sayings. They do nothing of the sort. They may show that Thomas' Coptic text has been influenced by that of Matthew-sa, but they show nothing about the relationship of Thomas' original Greek text with the Greek text of Matthew.

Likewise, the additional parallel member in Thomas' version of the saying is not conclusive evidence of the origin of Thomas' text of the saying. The reference to Luke 14:35 does not actually explain the addition since in that verse worthless salt is not thrown on the dung-hill;

---

[10] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 179.

it is not suitable for even the dung-hill; and, therefore, it is thrown away. Bartsch argues more plausibly at some length that this addition represents a secondary development of the text because it is suggested by the saying itself.[11] This observation is probably correct, but it does not aid us in determining whether or not the saying to which the addition was made came from Matthew. In fact, since this type of development took place largely in the oral tradition, it is more difficult to assume that a saying containing a secondary development could have come from Matthew's written Gospel than from an independent oral tradition.

The question of order also reveals no editorial evidence for Thomas' use of the Synoptic Gospels. Saying 93 (Matthew 7:6) is completely separated from Saying 26 (Matthew 7:3-5). It is, however, connected with Sayings 92 and 94 which may represent Matthew 7:7. Only if all three parts of Matthew 7:1-7 appeared together could we conclude knowledge of Matthew 7's order for Thomas, since the similar grouping between Sayings 92-94 and Matthew 7:6-7 is probably due to Matthew's sources rather than to Matthew.

---

[11] Bartsch NTS, VI, 252ff.

Matthew 7:6	Thomas 93
Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσίν μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μήποτε καταπατήσουσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῶν καὶ στραφέντες ῥήξωσιν ὑμᾶς.	ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ϯ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩϩⲟⲟⲣ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲟϫⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲕⲟⲡⲣⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̄ ⲙⲁⲣⲅⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲛⲛⲉϣⲁⲩ ϣⲓⲛⲁ ϫⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲁⲁϥ * * [±4]

CHAPTER X

THE ANSWER TO PRAYER

Matthew 7:7-11, Luke 11:9-13 and Sayings 92 and 94

This pericope has probably passed through several stages of development, but Bultmann refuses to make a decision as to which parts may be more original.[1] The first two verses each contain three parts: ask, seek, knock. Its parallelism breaks down somewhat from Matthew 7:9 (Luke 11:11) and on. In the last verse Matthew's τὰ ἀγαθὰ (good things) is almost certainly more original than Luke's πνεῦμα ἅγιον (Holy Spirit) as the importance of the Spirit for Luke's theology is well-known.[2]

The sayings about seeking, asking and knocking were evidently a part of Jewish folk piety.[3] Bultmann quotes *Pesikta* 176 as one example of many Jewish parallels: "When he knocks, the door is opened to him." Klostermann's quote from Epictetus even provides a non-Judeo-Christian parallel: ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε.

Saying 92 in its entirety reads:

> Jesus said: Seek and you will find, but those things which you asked me in those days, I did not tell you then; now I desire to tell them, but you do not seek after them.

---

[1] Bultmann, *History*, p. 87.

[2] Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, pp. 207ff. Cf. Manson, *Sayings*, pp. 81f; Klostermann, *Matthäusevangelium*, p. 67.

[3] Bultmann, *History*, p. 107

Saying 94 reads:

> Jesus said: He who seeks will find and he who knocks , it will be opened to him.

Saying 2a ought also to be a part of the discussion. It reads:

> Jesus said: Let him who seeks not cease seeking until he finds, and when he finds, he will be troubled, and when he is troubled, he will marvel and he will reign over the All.

The beginning sentence of Saying 92 is the same as the second member of Matthew 7:7 (Luke 11:9). Saying 94 appears to be a shortened form of the saying contained in Matthew 7:8 (Luke 11:10). Saying 2 is at least another saying based on the same idea of seeking.

As Schrage correctly observes, the fact that these sayings about seeking and finding are closely connected in both Thomas and our Gospels can tell us nothing about the source of Thomas' saying.[4] It is evident that the sayings were already together in Q and presumably elsewhere, too. The fact that Saying 93 provides no editorial evidence for Thomas' dependence on Matthew 7 has been shown earlier.

With regard to Saying 94, Schrage's argument is not very clear. He correctly observes that Thomas' main interest is in the seeking motif and that Saying 94 was taken into Thomas largely because it was connected with the seeking saying in Thomas' source.[5] He seems to imply that this source was Matthew 7, even though he has earlier admitted that this connection tells us nothing about Thomas' source. He notes the sahidic translations share several readings such as the "to him"[6] with

---

[4] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 177-178.

[5] Cf. Sayings 27, 58, 76, 90 and 111 besides the ones presently under discussion.

[6] Thomas shares this reading with f l d r aur and Ta^{np}.

"it shall be opened," and the use of the future tense for εὑρίσκει with Saying 94. None of these permit him to make any claim about Thomas' use of Matthew or Luke either, since such changes could easily occur independently of one another in the process of translation.

There is no possibility of editorial traits in Thomas, since the verse changed by Luke's substitution of "Holy Spirit" for "good things" is not transmitted by Thomas. Thus, the surest evidence for Thomas' use of our Gospels is once again missing.

Matthew 7:7-8	Luke 11:9-10	Thomas 92	Thomas 94
[7] αἰτεῖτε, καὶ	[9] κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω, αἰτεῖτε,	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ	[ⲡⲉϫⲉ] ⲓ̅ⲥ̅
δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ζητεῖτε,	καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ζητεῖ-	ϣⲓⲛⲉ	
καὶ εὑρήσετε· κρούετε,	τε, καὶ εὑρησετε· κρούετε,	ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁϭⲓⲛⲉ	
καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν.	καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν.		
[8] πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν	[10] πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν		
λαμβάνει, καὶ ὁ	λαμβάνει, καὶ ὁ		ⲡⲉⲧ
ζητῶν εὑρίσκει, καὶ	ζητῶν εὑρίσκει, καὶ		ϣⲓⲛⲉ ϥⲛⲁϭⲓⲛⲉ [ⲁⲩⲱ
τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοι-	τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοι-		ⲡⲉⲧⲱϩⲙ ⲉ]ϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲥⲉ
γήσεται.	γήσεται.		ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲛⲁϥ
		ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛⲉⲧⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ϫⲛⲟⲩⲉⲓ	
		ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲛϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲙ̅ⲡⲓ	
		ϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̅ ⲙ̅ⲯⲟⲟⲩ	
		ⲉⲧⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲩ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲉϩⲛⲁⲓ̈	
		ⲉϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ϣⲓⲛⲉ	
		ⲁⲛ ⲛ̅ⲥⲱ ⲟⲩ.	

CHAPTER XI

THE TEST OF GOODNESS

Matthew 7:16 and 12:34b-35, Luke 6:44-45
and Saying 45

Both the saying about picking grapes from thorns and the saying about the producing of good and evil from good and evil treasures are wisdom logia. Together with a third saying about good trees bearing good fruit and bad trees, evil fruit and a fourth saying about the mouth speaking from the heart, they formed a Q pericope.[1] The Q passage's order is represented by Matthew 7:16b-18 (thorns and trees) and by Luke 6:45--Matthew 12:34b-35 (good and evil treasure). The connection of Luke 6:45par with the others is secondary but was already present in Q.[2]

Both Synoptic Evangelists altered the Q passage considerably, if Bultmann's analysis is correct. Matthew divided it up, using the first two sayings (thorns and trees) in Matthew 7 and the last two (trees and treasures) in Matthew 12. Luke has been more faithful to Q in retaining the group as a whole, but he has shifted the order of the sayings, using the one about trees, then the one about thorns and finally that about treasures.

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 74.

[2] Bultmann, History, pp. 83-84.

The saying about not gathering grapes and figs from thorns and thistles has many Old Testament and profane parallels. Possible Old Testament passages include Isaiah 5:2 and 4, Genesis 3:18 and Hosea 10:8. Matthew and Luke each give substantially the same text. One of the three variations comes with regard to the order of grapes and figs in the saying. Matthew speaks of gathering grapes from thorns and figs from thistles but Luke reads figs from thorns and grapes from bramble bushes. Which of the two orders, if either, is original is almost impossible to judge. Manson feels that Matthew has the edge because the LXX uses ἀκανθῶν to translate Isaiah's "wild grapes" in Isaiah 5:2.[3] However, it could be that Matthew changed the verse to make it fit the Old Testament parallels. Matthew's question form of the saying is probably the more original, but this does not mean that the Lukan form is Luke's editorial work. All the variants between the two Synoptic texts show that the Evangelists were using different versions of Q at this point. No conclusive decision about originality can be drawn from the third variant, thorns or bramble bushes, either. Matthew's "thorns" has Old Testament parallels, but Luke's ἐκ βάτου σταφυλὴν τρυγῶσιν is technically correct.[4]

The saying about treasure and about the mouth speaking from the heart are reported in almost the same texts by Matthew and Luke. One of the chief differences between the two is again one of order. Luke gives the saying "for out of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaks" after the saying about good and bad treasures, while Matthew gives it

---

[3] Manson, Sayings, pp. 59-60.

[4] M'Neile, Matthew, p. 95; Plummer, Luke, p. 192.

immediately before the saying on treasures. Since they may once have been individual sayings, there is no basis on which to judge the original order.[5] The other important difference is the Lukan reading "of the heart" after the phrase "from the good treasure"; Matthew lacks it entirely so that it appears to be a Lukan addition to the saying. A third and a minor difference between the two Synoptic accounts is the use by Matthew of the nouns "man" and "treasure" in the evil segment of the saying as well as in the good part of it. Luke's text also contains a possessive pronoun "his" with στόμα which is lacking in Matthew.

Saying 45 reads:

> Jesus said: Grapes are not collected from thorns nor are figs picked from camel's thistles, for they do not give fruit. A good man brings forth good from his treasure, a evil man brings forth evil things from his treasure which is in his heart and he speaks evil things. For from the abundance of the heart he brings forth evil things.

Schrage argues for Thomas' dependence on Luke for Saying 45. He draws his first evidence from the order of the parts of the logion: Thomas and Luke both combine into one pericope what Matthew has in two places; Thomas' order of the last two parts (about treasures and words reflecting one's heart) agrees with Luke's. Against this argument of Schrage it must be pointed out that there is no reason for saying as he does that Luke combined what was separate in the sources which he and Matthew used; rather, the evidence supports Bultmann's view that all four parts were in Q and that Matthew separated them. Thomas' order, therefore, might show a dependence on Q but not necessarily on Luke and certainly not on Matthew. At the same time, it may just as easily be that the sayings were passed along together in other strands of the tradition besides Q so that a definite decision is not possible from the evidence of order. Since neither Luke's nor Matthew's positioning of the saying on the mouth speaking from the heart can be attributed to the Evangelists, Thomas' agreement with Luke proves nothing either.

---

[5] Bultmann, History, p. 84.

With regard to the first half of Saying 45, the part about picking grapes and figs, Schrage also argues that Thomas' agreement with Luke's statement form and his ουτε reveal his dependence on Luke. At the same time, however, Thomas is supposed to have taken the order of grapes/figs and the word "thistles" from Matthew. This is, however, simply expecting too much of Thomas. This type of combining of Matthew and Luke calls for an intimate knowledge of a synopsis of the Gospels on the part of Thomas, and it ignores the fact that there is no reasonable explanation as to why Thomas would have so combined the texts even if it had been within his capabilities and within the scope of his knowledge of those Gospels. At the same time, none of these agreements between Thomas and the Synoptic Gospels are agreements with editorial traits. Luke's statement form is secondary but not Lukan in origin. Furthermore, the original order of grapes/figs is also an open question. Their order is so easily reversed that such variants could occur independently of one another. In the same way the supposed "thistles" agreement with Matthew proves nothing since there is no definitive reason for assigning this reading to Matthew's work.

In the second half of Saying 45 (about treasures) Schrage also finds Thomas mixing Matthew and Luke. With Matthew he adds "man" and "treasure" to the evil segment of the saying and omits "of heart" after good treasure. With Luke he uses the γάρ clause after the treasures saying and his addition of the phrase "which is in his heart" after evil treasure must be due to Luke's similar reading after good treasure. He rejects the possibility that Luke and Thomas expanded the saying in this similar but different way independently from each other. However, his rejection is based on his previous assumption that Thomas was dependent on Luke from the position of the *γάρ* clause. As we have seen in Bultmann's reconstruction of Q, this assumption can hardly be made. Therefore, Thomas could have produced the reading independently of Luke.[6] The additions of man and treasure likewise prove nothing, except that Matthew and Luke were using different recensions of Q, and that Thomas' tradition was similar to Matthew's in this particular instance.

The arguments for dependence made from a study of the additions and alterations in the sayings as reported by Thomas are perhaps more serious than those just answered. Bartsch correctly argues that the additions; namely, "for they give no fruit" and "and speaks evil things" are secondary developments because they grow out of the sayings themselves. Likewise, the change from a material subject "mouth speaks" to a personal subject "he speaks" is a secondary development. Bartsch (Schrage agrees) concludes from this that such developments could only have come out of Synoptic combination of the sayings as a warning against the wrong use of words.[7] However, this combining of sayings took place before the material came into the Synoptic Evangelists' hands. Unless one assumes that the various branches of the oral tradition were extremely different from one another, one must assume that Thomas could also have found them together elsewhere than in Q or our Gospels.[8] Furthermore, the type of secondary developments found here are usually the results of oral transmission. We have argued earlier against the view that the texts of the written Gospels circulated to the extent necessary for Thomas to have made this kind of use of them. Thus, Thomas' secondary developments actually seem to indicate the use of another tradition as his source.

---

[6] Several parallels reported by Quispel support the belief that this kind of a reading is likely to be produced independently at different times and in different places and in different languages. Quispel, in *VC*, XI(1957), 198, reports that Old Latin MS e reads: *Malus homo de malo thesauro cordis sur malum proferit*; in *NTS*, V(1958-1959), 286, he gives other support for this reading in the various *Diatessera* and in the German poem *Heliand*.

[7] Bartsch, *NTS*, ~~V~~I(1960), 253-255.

---

[8] It is entirely possible that such additions were also made independently in different times and places. With regard to the addition about giving no fruit, one can compare this modern commentary on the saying from Manson, Sayings, p. 60: "The plants mentioned are typical weeds (Gen. 3:18, Hos. 10:8), from which no useful produce can be expected."

Matthew 7:16b	Luke 6:44b-45	Thomas 45
[16b] μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλὰς ἢ ἀπὸ τριβόλων σῦκα;	[44b] οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσιν σῦκα, οὐδὲ ἐκ βάτου σταφυλὴν τρυγῶσιν.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲙⲁⲩϫⲉⲗⲉ ⲉⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ϣⲟⲛⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲁⲩⲕⲱⲧϥ ⲕⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲥⲣ̄ϭⲁⲙⲟⲩⲗ ⲙⲁⲩϯ ⲕⲁⲣⲡⲟⲥ
[34b] ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λάλει.		ⲅⲁⲣ
[35] ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλει ἀγαθά, καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει πονηρά.	[45] ὁ ἀγαθός ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ προφέρει τὸ πονηρόν.	ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲣ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϣⲁϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉϥⲉϩⲟ ⲟⲩⲕⲁⲕⲟⲥ ⲣ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϣⲁϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲛ̄ⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉϥⲉϩⲟ ⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧϩⲛ̄ ⲡⲉϥϩⲏⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ϥϫⲱ ⲛ̄ϩⲛ̄ⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ
	ἐκ γὰρ περισσεύματος καρδίας λάλει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.	ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲅⲁⲣ ϩⲙ̄ ⲫⲟⲩⲟ ⲙ̄ⲫⲏⲧ ϣⲁϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϩⲛ̄ⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲟⲛ.

CHAPTER XII

TWO CLAIMANTS TO DISCIPLESHIP

Matthew 8:18-22, Luke 9:57-60 and Saying 86

This pericope contains two sayings which are applied to the difficulties of being a disciple of Jesus. The first saying expresses man's homelessness in this world "but the son of man has nowhere to lay his head," and the second expresses the need to leave all to follow him. "Follow me, and let the dead bury their own dead." Matthew 8:18 and Luke 9:57, the Evangelists' introductions to the pericope, offer completely different contexts for the sayings. The consensus of opinion is that the Lukan verse is definitely editorial.[1] Otherwise, the texts of the sayings themselves (Matthew 8:20--Luke 9:58, Matthew 8:21--Luke 9:59-60a) are almost identical.

The only major controversy about the pericope is over the nature of the "homelessness" saying. Bultmann[2] holds that it was originally a secular proverb which has been given specific Christian meaning in the tradition.[3] Son of man is taken then as meaning simply man.[4] Manson disputes this, saying that a proverb needs to contain a kernel of truth to exist and that this Logion does not. His argument is as follows:

---

[1] Cf. Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, pp. 61, 66; Schmidt, Der Rahmen, p. 260; Bultmann, History, p. 28.

[2] Bultmann, History, pp. 28f.

[3] Bultmann, History, p. 98, n. 1, and others quote Plutarch Tib. Gracch. 9 as a folk lore parallel: "as even the wild beasts who inhabit Italy have a hole and each of them has a bed and a place to sit, but for those who fight over Italy both the air and water fail . . ."

[4] Cf. M'Neile, Matthew, pp. xx and 108f.

> and this proverb is required to say that man, in contrast to foxes and birds, has no home; which is plain nonsense. For man, of all the living creatures, has provided himself with the most elaborate and permanent lodgings.[5]

His argument (and that of others also) is that the saying employs apocalyptic imagery after the manner of Daniel 7. Thus, the birds are to be understood as the gentile nations, the foxes as enemies, and the Son of Man as the apocalyptic redeemer.

Manson's argument contains within itself the seeds of its own downfall. The saying does contain a truth which could have been a folk-proverb: birds and foxes come by their "homes" naturally, man has to provide a home for himself. Furthermore, as M'Neile aptly observes, the apocalyptic interpretation of the saying is forced and unnatural.[6] Whether this saying was put onto the lips of Jesus in the tradition, as Bultmann says, or whether it was actually used by Jesus himself is a matter of subjective judgment. According to Held, Matthew used the verse because it showed that the Church in her persecution shares in the humiliation its Lord experienced during his earthly life.[7]

Thomas Saying 86 reads:

> Jesus said: [The foxes have] the[ir holes] and the birds have [the]ir nest, but the son of man does not have a place to lay his head and to rest it.

The closeness of Thomas' text with that of Q means that there is no possibility of evidence for or against literary dependence. Thomas does have a few minor differences from our Gospels but none of them significant: He omits the τοῦ οὐρανοῦ with birds, evidently has the singular "nest" instead of nests, uses the verb "have" twice in the first half of the saying, adds a few possessive pronouns with holes, nest and head, and adds a closing phrase "and to rest." Of these only the last two need further mention. The possessive pronouns might show an independent source as Quispel tries to show,[8] but they could easily be only the result of the translation process as Wilson observes.[9] The addition at the end is most probably a gnostic addition, although it may have been a natural development of the saying.[10]

---

[5] Manson, Sayings, pp. 72f.

[6] M'Neile, Matthew, pp. 108f.

[7] Bornkamm-Barth-Held, Überlieferung, pp. 195, 259f.

Schrage tries to find some evidence for dependence on the basis of parallel readings to these minor variants in the history of the text and in the Sahidic versions.[11] At the conclusion he is content just to list them, however, without making any absolute claims as to their value. In the last analysis, Thomas' source cannot be determined on the basis of this saying alone. Since the evidence from the other sayings shows he did not use our Gospels for them, there are no reasons for assuming any differently at this point.

---

[8] Quispel, VC, 13.

[9] Wilson, Studies, p. 137. Cf. RSV of Matthew 8:20par for English example.

[10] Cf. Sayings 60, 50, 90, 51.

[11] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 169-170.

Matthew 8:20	Luke 9:58	Thomas 86
καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ.	καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ὁ Ἰησοῦς· αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ [ⲛⲃⲁϣⲟⲣ ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁ]ⲩ ⲛ[ⲉⲩⲃⲏⲃ] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ϩⲁⲗⲁⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲙ̄[ⲡⲉ]ⲩⲙⲁϩ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲛ̄ⲛ[ⲟⲩ]ⲙⲁ ⲉⲣⲓⲕⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥ'ⲁⲡⲉ ⲛϥⲙ̄ⲧⲟⲛ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ

CHAPTER XIII

THE QUESTION ABOUT FASTING

Matthew 9:14-17, Mark 2:18-22, Luke 5:33-39

and Sayings 104 and 47

The saying about which this apophthegm is constructed is found in Mark 2:19a par: "Can the wedding guests fast while the bridegroom is with them?" According to Bultmann 18b was probably the original introduction to the apophthegm, while the rest of the pericope is the result of secondary development.[1] All three Evangelists, therefore, provide differing descriptions of the scene into which the saying is placed. Since the saying is used to defend Jesus' disciples rather than himself, it is clear that this situation is not its original setting. The conclusion about fasting later on may or may not be due to Mark, while it is probable in Bultmann's opinion that the connection of vv. 21ff (new wine in old bottles, new patches on old clothes) comes from Mark. Thus, Luke felt free to add in 5:39 still another originally independent saying which was probably a secular mashal.

Both Matthew and Luke follow Mark's account as a whole, although each of their texts diverge from the Marcan readings. To Matthew the introductory *τότε* of 9:14, the *δέ* after *οὐδείς* of 9:16a and the γάρ in 9:16b can be probably attributed.[2] To Luke can be assigned with certainty the introductory words "and he told a parable also to them" of 5:36a and the "torn from a new garment" later in the same verse.

---

[1] Bultmann, *History*, pp. 18-19. Cf. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen*, pp. 86-88.

The injection of the issue of prayer into the Lukan pericope may or may not be due to Luke. Since prayer plays a special role in Luke's theology, its inclusion here is no surprise.[3] Two possibilities for its origin seem open: one, Luke simply added it on his own accord in the familiar setting of fasting; two, he possessed a source which introduced the apophthegm in this way and he chose it over Mark's account because of its mention of prayer. The latter seems more probable in this particular case. In the first place, if he added it on his own accord in 5:33, why did he not also add it in 5:35 so that prayer would also be commended for that later stage in history? If he merely found it added in one of his sources, he would have been less willing to make such an addition in 5:35 because of his conservative use of his sources. Secondly, the expression ποιεῖν δεήσεις for prayer is used by Luke only here. Elsewhere, he uses προσεύχομαι thirty-six times, δέομαι seven times (of prayer), the noun προσευχή nine times and δέησις two other times.[4] If he added the idea of prayer here on his own, it is much more probable that he would have used another expression than the one we actually find.

---

[2] M'Neile, *Matthew*, pp. 121-123, gives a good summary of this material.

[3] Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, pp. 208f, points out that prayer is the believer's timeless connection with Luke's second epoch, the time of salvation.

[4] According to a study of Moulton and Geden, *Concordance*, pp. 183, 863-864.

Saying 104 reads:

> They said to him : Come and let us pray today and let us fast. Jesus said: What then is the sin which I have done, or in what have they conquered me? But when the bridegroom comes out of the bridal chamber, then let them fast and let them pray.

Saying 47b-c reads:

> Would anyone drink old wine and immediately he would desire to drink new wine? And, they do not usually put new wine into old wineskins, lest they burst, and they do not put old wine into a new wineskin, lest it spoil it. They do not usually sew an old patch on a new garment, because there would come a rent.

Grant-Freedman are certain that sayings such as Saying 104 are based on our Gospels.[5] The changes in this saying are due to reflection about the theological problems of the sinlessness of Jesus. Schrage is perhaps not as certain as Grant-Freedman, as he is content to call Saying 104 an echo of Mark 2:19f.[6] He notes the important fact that Thomas, like Luke, adds prayer to the saying. Of course, Sayings 6 and 14 also join prayer and fasting together with almsgiving. Although the first part of Thomas' scene differs from the Synoptics in that Jesus' own conduct is called into account, he feels that the second half presupposes the Synoptic apophthegm. This latter observation is just not so. The "them" of "let them fast and pray" is nowhere defined in Thomas as Jesus' own disciples as it is in the Synoptic parallels. In fact, it could scarcely be his disciples, for as Sayings 6 and 14 clearly state, no gnostic ever needs to fast or to pray.[7] The "them" must, therefore, refer to his opponents and to all non-gnostics who question his conduct at the beginning of Saying 104. The saying does not, then, presuppose the Synoptic scene at all.

---

[5] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, pp. 32-35, 191.

[6] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 193.

[7] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 191, correctly notes that only

Quispel, on the other hand, concludes that the similarity of Jesus' reply in Thomas to a fragment of the Nazarene Gospel proves that Thomas' text is from a Jewish-Christian tradition.[8] The Nazarene passage reads:

> Behold, the mother of the Lord and his brethren said to him: John the Baptist baptizes unto the remission of sins, let us go and be baptized by him. But he said to them: Wherein have I sinned that I should go and be baptized by him? Unless what I have said is ignorance (a sin of ignorance).[9]

Haenchen says that Quispel's neglect of the difference between the questioners in the Nazarene Gospel and in Thomas is methodologically incorrect.[10] True enough, but at least the quote shows that the answer given by Thomas was abroad in the tradition, that is, that it was not invented by Thomas himself as a change in the Synoptic Saying.

The arguments for the dependence of Saying 47c on the Synoptic Gospels are similar to those met elsewhere. Since 47c is similar to Luke 5:39, Luke's addition to the pericope, Thomas most probably knew the saying from Luke. Schrage admits the possibility but not the probability that the saying as a secular mashal was known independently by Luke and Thomas.[11] He does not discuss another possibility, namely, that this saying about wine may have already been joined to the previous sayings about wine in several parts of the oral tradition. If so, then the

---

gnostics enter the bridal chamber according to Saying 75 and that they never leave it.

[8] Quispel, VC, XI(1957) 190-191.

[9] Paul Vielhauer, "The Gospel of the Nazareans," in Edgar Hennecke New Testament Apocrypha, ed. W. Schneemelcher, trans. R. Mcl. Wilson, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), I, pp. 146-147.

[10] Haenchen, ThR, XXVII(1960), 164

[11] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 112.

addition may not be due to either Luke or to Thomas.[12] As corroborating evidence, he finds an agreement between Thomas and Luke-sa in a usual translation of "wine." This, indeed, may show that the Coptic translator of Thomas knew the Sahidic translation of the Lukan saying. It does not, however, tell us anything about the source of the saying in his Greek Vorlage.

Saying 47c presents the members of the last part of the Synoptic pericope, but in a different order. Thomas' additions about putting old wine in new wineskins and his reading old patch is most probably secondary in nature.[13] However, as we have said at earlier points, this secondary development does not prove that the Synoptic Gospels were Thomas' sources, and that it in fact argues against that conclusion. Schrage argues that Thomas' agreements with Matthew over against Mark/Luke also argue for his dependence on Matthew here.[14]

The main argument for Thomas' dependence, however, concerns that of the Synoptic order of the sayings which Thomas is supposed to have confused. A comparison of Thomas' order of these sayings with the entire Synoptic pericope is indeed a crucial point, but it is one which proves Thomas' independence from, not his dependency on, our Gospels. According to Bultmann the genius of the Marcan pericope is the joining together of the bridal chamber saying with the rest of the sayings about wine and patches. Thomas gives us no indication that he knew that combination of sayings, for he gives the first part of the Synoptic pericope in Saying 104 and the second parts much earlier as part of Saying 47. Thus, since no editorial traits appear in Thomas here, it is not probable that he used our Synoptic accounts as his sources.

---

[12] We must remember that Bultmann's judgment that Luke added it was based only on the evidence from the Synoptics. The fact that Thomas also joins this saying with the others in a different order and without knowledge of the Synoptic pericope as a unit raises the necessity for a new judgment.

[13] Haenchen, Botschaft, p. 51, n. 53, gives the reasons against Quispel's counter claim.

[14] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 112-116.

This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Thomas' sayings contain readings which cannot be explained as due to our Gospels. Jesus' claim of sinlessness in Saying 104 is a case in point. It may be from a tradition later than our Gospels, but it is not one necessarily derived from them.

Importance must also be given to the fact that Thomas' Saying 104 presupposes a setting not only different from our Gospels but also one which may represent an earlier stage of development since in it the question is applied to Jesus himself. Bultmann's judgment that the Synoptic saying is a secondary creation of the community was based on the fact that the saying was directed to the disciples' behavior. Thomas' saying may show that the saying can be attributed to Jesus after all and that in the Synoptic apophthegm it has been applied to the situation of the Church. Of course, those secondary details may simply have been omitted because they were not important in a gnostic milieu. Thomas' setting also lacks the secondary references to the Pharisees and the disciples of the Baptist.

Thomas Saying 47 supplies a reading that also may indicate its independence of the Synoptic accounts. The reading is the *ἵνα μή* in the saying about wineskins at the place where all the Synoptics use *εἰ δὲ μή* (γε). That Thomas deliberately changed the Greek idiom simply to confuse the nature of his sources is hardly credible. It would mean that he deliberately used Luke 5:39, a verse peculiar to Luke and thereby traceable to him, and at the same time changed his Greek text in this minor way to conceal his sources.[15] This is highly improbable.

The evidence from the first part of Saying 47 is inconclusive as to the matter of sources.

Thomas Saying 47a reads:

> Jesus said: It is impossible for a man to mount two horses and to stretch two bows, and it is impossible for a servant to serve two masters, otherwise he will honor the one and the other he will offend.

The additional phrases in Thomas seem to be the results of secondary development. Bartsch especially emphasizes this as evidence that Thomas used our Gospels. This argument we again reject.[16] Schrage says that the case depends upon one's view of Luke's οἰκέτης Thomas shares with him.[17] This judgment is correct; the question, however, must remain open, as the case for οἰκέτης as Lukan is not at all certain, as Schrage himself admits. Köster comes to the same final conclusion: the οἰκέτης is probably Lukan but the question cannot be decided with certainty.[18] To build a case for Thomas' use of our Gospels at this point would be very risky indeed, especially since the rest of Saying 47 does not appear to be dependent on them.

---

[15] He also would have had to change Luke's θέλει to ἐπιθύμει for the same reason.

[16] Bartsch, *NTS*, VI(1960), 251-253.

[17] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, pp. 109-111.

[18] Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 75.

Matthew 9:14, 15b	Mark 2:18, 20	Luke 5:33, 35	Thomas 104, 47b-c
	[18] καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰω-		
	άννου καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι νη-		
[14] τότε προσέρχονται	στεύοντες. καὶ ἔρχονται		
αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου			
λέγοντες· διὰ τί	καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· διὰ τί	[33c] οἱ δὲ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν·	ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ [ⲛⲁϥ] ϫⲉ ⲁⲙⲟⲩ
ἡμεῖς	οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ	οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου	
οἱ φαρισαῖοι νη-	μαθηταὶ τῶν φαρισαίων νη-	νη-	ⲛⲧⲛ̄
στεύουσιν	στεύουσιν,	στεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δε-	ϣⲗⲏⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲛ̄
		ήσεις ποιοῦντα, ὁμοίως καὶ	ⲣⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲩ
οἱ δὲ	οἱ δὲ	οἱ τῶν φαρισαίων, οἱ δὲ	
μαθηταί σου οὐ νηστεύου-	σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύου-	σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν	
σιν;	σιν;	καὶ πίνουσιν.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ
			ⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲡⲉ ⲡ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲉⲓ
			ⲁⲁϥ ⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩϫⲣⲟ ⲉⲣⲟⲉⲓ
[15b] ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι	[20] ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι	[35] ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, καὶ	ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ϩⲟⲧⲁⲛ ⲉⲣ
ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν	ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν	ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν	ϣⲁⲛⲡⲛⲩⲙⲫⲓⲟⲥ ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νη-	ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νη-	ὁ νυμφίος, τότε νη-	ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲛⲩⲙⲫⲱⲛ ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲙⲁⲣⲟ
στεύουσιν.	στεύουσιν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ	στεύουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις	ⲩⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲁⲣⲟⲩ
	ἡμέρᾳ.	ταῖς ἡμέραις.	ϣⲗⲏⲗ’

Matthew 9:16-17	Mark 2:21-22	Luke 5:36	Thomas 47d, b, c
		36 ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν	
16 οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐπι-	21 οὐδεὶς ἐπί-	πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐπί-	47d ⲙⲁⲩϫ̄ⲗⲟ ⲧⲟ
βάλλει ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους	βλημα ῥάκους ἀννάφου	βλημα ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινου	ⲉⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲁⲥ ⲁϣⲧⲏ̄ⲛ̄ϣⲁⲉⲓ
ἀννάφου ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ	ἐπιράπτει ἐπὶ ἱματιον	σχίσας ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον	
παλαιῷ· αἴρει	παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μή, αἴρει	παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μή γε, καὶ	ⲉⲡⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ
γὰρ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ	τὸ πλήρωμα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ	τὸ καινὸν σχίσει καὶ τῷ	ⲟⲩⲡⲱϩ ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ
τοῦ ἱματίου, καὶ	καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ, καὶ	παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνήσει τὸ	
χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται.	χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται.	ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ.	
17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέ-	22 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέ-	37 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νε-	47c ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲁⲩⲛⲟⲩϫ ⲏⲣⲏ ⲃ̄ⲃ
ον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ	ον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ	ον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ	ⲣⲣⲉ ⲉⲁⲥⲕⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲥ ϫⲉ
δὲ μή γε, ῥήγνυνται	δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος	δὲ μή γε, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ	ⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲡⲱϩ ⲁⲩⲱ
οἱ ἀσκοί, καὶ ὁ οἶ-	τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ ὁ οἶ-	νέος τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ αὐτὸς	ⲙⲁⲩⲛⲉϫ'
νος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ	νος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ	ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ	
ἀσκοὶ ἀπόλλυνται. ἀλλὰ	ἀσκοί. ἀλλὰ οἶνον	ἀπολοῦνται. 38 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέ-	ⲏⲣⲏ
βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς	νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς.	ον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλη-	ⲛⲁⲥ
ἀσκοὺς καινούς, καὶ ἀμφότε-		τέον.	ⲉⲁⲥⲕⲟⲥ ⲃ̄ⲃⲣ̄ⲣⲉ ϣⲓⲛⲁ ϫⲉ
ροι συντηροῦνται.		39 καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὼν παλαιὸν	47b ⲛϥⲧⲉⲕⲁϥ. ⲙⲁⲣⲉⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲥⲉ ⲣ̄ⲡ
		θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ	ⲁⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ϥⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙ
		παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν.	ⲉⲓ ⲁⲥⲱ ⲏⲣⲏ ⲃ̄ⲃⲣⲣⲉ

Matthew 6:24	Luke 6:13	Thomas 47a
οὐδεὶς δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν· ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἕνα μισήσει καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει ἢ ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει· οὐ δύνασθε θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ.	οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν· ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἕνα μισήσει καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει ἢ ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει· οὐ δύνασθε θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ϭⲟⲙ ⲛⲧⲉⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲧⲉⲗⲟ ⲁϩⲧⲟ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ϥϫⲱⲗⲕ ⲙⲡⲓⲧⲉ ⲥⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲛ ϭⲟⲙ ⲛⲧⲉⲟⲩϩⲙϩ̄ⲟ̄ⲗ ϣⲙ̄ϣⲉ ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲏ ϥⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲧⲓⲙⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲁ· ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ ϥⲛⲁⲣ̄ ϩⲩⲃⲣⲓⲍⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ.

CHAPTER XIV

EXHORTATION TO FEARLESS CONFESSION

Matthew 10:26-27--Mark 4:22, Luke 8:17 and 12:2-3 and Sayings 5, 6 and 33a

This pericope contains two sayings already joined together in Q, if Bultmann is correct.[1] Mark 4:22, which contains only the first of these sayings, the one about the certain revelation of this hidden, supports his view that the sayings did not originally belong together. Matthew 10:26f./Luke 12:2f. represent Q while Mark 4:22 is another version of the saying. The fact that all three Evangelists use the sayings in different contexts indicates, as Jeremias says, that their original meanings were unknown to the Evangelists.[2]

Bultmann feels that the second saying about secrets being proclaimed from the housetops was originally a secular saying.[3] Manson disputes this because he feels it could only have had a religious meaning, that is, nothing can be hidden from God.[4] It seems obvious, however, that even earthly secrets do not remain hidden for long and that the saying could easily have been a popular proverb. The oriental reference to proclamation from the rooftops also supports Bultmann's contentions. Whatever position one chooses to hold on the origin of the saying, it is clear that Matthew 10:27 is in a secondary form compared with Luke 12:3. The saying in Luke is a warning; in Matthew it is a word of counsel which is put on the lips of Jesus: "What _I_ say to you . . ." This change to the first person Bultmann attributes to Matthew.[5] If the saying was used as a liturgical rubric as Klostermann suggests, however, it may have come to Matthew already in this form.[6]

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 83. Cf. Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte, p. 229.

[2] Jeremias, Gleichnisse, p. 219, n. 2.

[3] Bultmann, History, pp. 95, 150.

[4] Manson, Sayings, p. 106, compares it with Matthew 6:1-19.

Other redactional traits appear in the introductions used by both Evangelists. Matthew says, "Do not fear them"; Luke applies the saying to the hypocrisy of the Pharisees. Luke also may have added "in private rooms" to complete the parallelism of the second saying.

Thomas Saying 5b (Plate 81, 13-14) reads:

> For there is nothing which is hidden which shall not be revealed.

Thomas Saying 6c (Plate 81, 21-23) reads:

> For there is nothing which is hidden which shall not be revealed, and there is nothing which is concealed which will remain without being made manifest.

Thomas Saying 33a (Plate 87, 10-12) reads:

> Jesus said: That which you shall hear in your ear (and) in your ear, preach it on your housetops.

Schrage divides what we have labeled Saying 6c into two parts corresponding to the two halves of the compound sentence. He calls the first half 6a and the second 6b. He then proceeds to dispose of the problem of sources by means of the following analysis: Sayings 5b and 6a (his designations) are supposed to be dependent on Luke since they agree with Luke 8:17 which is the Lukan version of Mark 4:22.[7]

---

[5] Bultmann, _History_, p. 95.

[6] Klostermann, _Matthäusevangelium_, p.90, says it may have been used by a reader who whispered the word to an assistant to be proclaimed aloud.

This judgment has two major errors. First of all, although Sayings 5b and 6a do agree word for word in Coptic, the Greek behind them is quite different as is shown by the two quotations from Pap. Ox. 654.[8] Saying 6a (Pap. Ox. 654, 32-39) at least cannot be attributed to Luke 8:17, therefore. It is inaccurate to identify both of these sayings with Luke 8:17 after this difference is noted. The most that can be said is that the Greek behind Saying 5b in Coptic appears to be that of Luke 8:17.

Secondly, it is not precise to call Luke 8:17 a Lukan revision of Mark. Although Luke was following Mark's order at this point, it is clear that the text of Luke 8:17 does not represent Luke's revision of Mark's text. If we compare only Mark 4:22 and Luke 8:17, such a revision by Luke is a possibility since Luke's version appears to avoid Mark's clumsy ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα and ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα clauses while adding γνωσθῇ which could have been done under the influence of Q. Nevertheless, an analysis of the verses preceding Luke 8:17 argue against holding that Luke was merely revising Mark. Although Luke 8 follows the order of Mark 4, there are actually very few cases in which Luke's text agrees with Mark's. From Luke 8:11 through 8:16 there are only these agreements with Mark: verse 12, δέ, εἰσιν, τὴν ὁδόν;

---

[7] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 34-37.

[8] Even though the Coptic does not follow the Greek of Pap. Ox. 654, exactly since it seems to change the position of the καὶ τεθαμμένον clause, it seems certain that Saying 6a (Schrage) is a translation of the Greek given by Pap. Ox. 654, lines 39-42.

verse 13, αἱ ὅταν ἀκούωσιν, καί; verse 14, οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντς; verse 16, ἐπί, ἵνα. If Luke were merely re-writing Mark's Greek, we should expect far more agreement than this. Thus, we can conclude that the text of Luke 8:17 is not the result of the editorial work of Luke, but that it is due to one of his sources. Therefore, the agreement between Saying 5b (Pap. Ox. 654, 29-31) does not prove Thomas' use of Luke as his source. Thomas could have obtained it from Luke's source or from one similar to it.

Schrage treats part of the Saying 5a as a parallel with 6c: "and what is hidden from you shall be made manifest to you." The reference to the second person singular, he feels, is due to the influence of the Q versions ἀποκαλυφθήσεται. Saying 6c could be related to either the Marcan or Q passages since it has the same concepts of hidden and revealed. The conclusive argument for him is that both Thomas 6c and Luke-sa for Luke 8:17 translate the conjunction ______ with "and there is nothing . . ." This proves in his view Thomas' dependence on Luke-sa. The source of the reading is the Q version (οὐδέν) of the saying.

His argument about Saying 5a cannot be more than a guess as to the source of the saying which as a whole has no obvious New Testament parallel. Schrage's quote of Keph. 163, 28f shows that this type of a saying fit well with gnostic beliefs.[9] The argument from Luke-sa 8:17 assumes that Thomas was using Luke as his source and is, thus, circular reasoning. Luke-sa may here translate Luke 8:17's οὐδέ in this way, but we do not know that Thomas was also translating οὐδέ. In fact, this part of Saying 6c is related to the Greek of Pap. Ox. 654, line 31, which is omitted by the Coptic in Saying 5b, so that Thomas may actually have been translating a καί, not οὐδέ.[10] Thus, there are no grounds for holding Thomas' dependency on our Gospels at this point either.

---

[9] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 35, n. 1.

Saying 33 contains the second of the sayings from the Q pericope. According to Schrage, Thomas is dependent on Matthew's version of Q because he uses the word "hear" and the imperative of "preach." Both Thomas and Matthew also omit Luke's phrase "in secret places."

If all of Matthew 10:27 were due to Matthew's editorial work, then Schrage would have pointed out the first editorial trait we have found in Thomas. The use of first person in v. 27a is probably due to Matthew. The rest of verse 27 comes from Q. Thus, the specifically editorial change is missing in Thomas. Thomas' saying like Matthew's is secondary in that it is no longer a word of warning, but that in itself proves nothing. The saying had undoubtedly undergone such a change prior to and independent of Matthew.[11]

The evidence drawn from a comparison of the Synoptic combination of sayings with that in Thomas gives strong support to the position that Thomas did not use the Synoptic Gospels or Q as his sources. The Q passage joins together the sayings about the hidden coming to light and about secrets being shouted from rooftops. Thomas separates them completely from one another by giving the first in Sayings 5 and 6, the second as the first part of Saying 33. Mark (4:22) and Luke (8:17) join the saying about the hidden with the saying about the placing of a lamp on a lampstand. Thomas uses the first in Sayings 5 and 6, and the second in Saying 33b. Thus, Thomas gives us no evidence that he knew these sayings in the framework given them either in Q or in Mark's general order. This evidence combined with the results of our editorial analysis shows that Thomas did not use the Synoptic Gospels as his sources for these sayings. Rather, he was making use in his own way of sayings he knew from an oral tradition, sayings which fit in well with the theme that the gnostic has the secrets of the universe within his grasp.

---

[10] For a discussion of whether or not the Coptic version is a more gnostic version one may compare Puech, in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, p. 306; Haenchen, Botschaft, p. 36, n. 7; Gartner, Theology of . . . Thomas, pp. 83-84.

[11] Cf. Bultmann, History, pp. 95-96, on its use even in Q as a

---

promise.

Mark 4:22	Luke 8:17	Pap. Ox. 654,4	Thomas 5b	Matthew 10:26-27	Luke 12:2-3
[22] οὐ γάρ ἐστὶν τι κρυπτὸν ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ· οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπό- κρυφον ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανε- ρόν.	[17] οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενή- σεται, οὐδὲ απόκρυ- φον ὃ οὐ μὴ γνω- σθῇ καὶ εἰς φανε- ρὸν ἔλθῃ.	[οὐ γὰρ ἐσ]τιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανε[ρὸν γενή- σεται, καὶ τεθαμ- μένον ὃ οὐκ ἐγερθήσεται.	ⲙⲛ̄ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉϥϩⲏⲧ ⲉϥ ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ	[26] οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν κεκαλυμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσε- ται, καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνω- θήσεται.	οὐδὲν δὲ συγκε- καλυμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ αποκαλυφθήσε- ται, καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνω- θήσεται.
Pap. Ox. 654	Thomas 6c	Pap. Ox. 1,8	Thomas 33a		
[οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐστι]ν ἀ[π]οκεκρ[υμμένον ὃ οὐ φανε]ρὸν ἔσται	ⲙⲛ̄ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉϥϩⲏⲧ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲉϥϩⲟⲃⲥ̄ ⲉⲩⲛⲁϭⲱ ⲟⲩⲉϣⲛ̄ ϭⲟⲗⲡ	λέγει Ἰησοῦς ⟨ὃ⟩ ἀκούεις εἰς τὸ ἓν ὠτίον σου, το[	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲡⲉⲧⲕⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲕⲙⲁⲁϫⲉ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲕⲙⲁⲁϫⲉ ⲧⲁϣⲉⲟ ⲉⲓϣ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ϩⲓϫⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲛϫⲉⲛⲉⲡⲱⲣ	[27] ὃ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἴπατε ἐν τῷ φωτί· καὶ ὃ εἰς τὸ οὖς ἀκούετε κηρύξ- ατε ἐπὶ τῶν δω- μάτων.	[3] ἀνθ᾽ ὧν ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἴπατε ἐν τῷ φωτὶ ἀκουθήσεται, καὶ ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὖς ἐλαλήσατε ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις κηρυχθή- σεται ἐπὶ τῶν δω- μάτων

CHAPTER XV

DIVISIONS IN HOUSEHOLDS

Matthew 10:34-36, Luke 12:49, 51-53
and Sayings 10 and 16

This pericope contains two I-sayings which are also found in Thomas. The first of them, "I have come to cast fire . . . ," is found only in Luke 12:49. It is at least possible, however, that the verse was in Q and was omitted by Matthew.[1] Bultmann feels it most probable that this saying and the ones after it are a part of the gnostic myth which has been put on the lips of Jesus.[2] The fire in that case can refer to the fire of judgment.[3] It seems clear that the Greek of the second part of this saying, τί θέλω εἰ κτλ is translation Greek and should be translated: "How I wish that it were already kindled!"[4]

---

[1] Manson, *Sayings*, pp. 120-121, says Matthew may have omitted it because it did not suit the context he was using for Q at that point, that is, as a word of comfort from Jesus to the twelve. The literal agreement ἦλθον βαλεῖν between Luke 12:49/Matthew 10:34 certainly suggests that both verses were joined together in Q by this catchword connection. In that case, the δοῦναι of Luke 12:51 would probably represent a change of Q by Luke.

[2] Bultmann, *History*, pp. 153-155.

[3] Cf. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, p. 109.

[4] Cf. Black, *An Aramaic Approach*, p. 89; Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 827; Blass-Debrunner-Funk, *A Greek Grammar*, p. 182, section 360 (4). For a similar use of εἰ after θέλω one can compare Sirach 23:14: καὶ θελήσεις εἰ μὴ ἐγεννήθης.

The second saying is given in different versions by Matthew and Luke. Both versions begin by denying that Jesus came to bring peace on earth. Bultmann points out that both Matthew's μὴ νομίσητε and Luke's δοκεῖτε are defenses against the doubting of Jesus' person and work.[5] Matthew's ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι κτλ is similarly a secondary version of the saying as it shows how the Church has substituted Jesus for God as the ruler of history. Matthew's βαλεῖν and Luke's δοῦναι may be translational variants.[6] One definite editorial trait does appear in Luke's account, the phrase ἀπὸ τὸ νῦν.[7] A Matthean trait may appear in the Matthew 10:36 as Matthew may have here completed the Old Testament quote from Micah 7:6.

Thomas Saying 10 reads:

> Jesus said: I have come to cast fire on the world and behold, I guard it until it is aflame.

Thomas Saying 16 reads:

> Jesus said: Men possibly think that I have come to cast peace on the world, and they do not know that I have come to cast divisions on the earth, fire, sword, war. For there shall be five in a house, three shall be against two and two against three; the father against the son and the son against the father, and they shall stand as solitaries.

Saying 10 seems to present a gnostic interpretation of the saying we find also in Luke 12:49, or perhaps the reverse is true if Bultmann is correct, that is, Luke 12:49 is a Christianized version of a gnostic saying. Schrage says that there can be no decision about sources since there are no editorial traits in Luke 12:49.[8] A more precise statement is that without such traits there is no proof that Thomas used Luke as a source; other considerations together with the absence of such traits might allow us to make a decision.[9] Kasser attempts to prove dependency by positing several scribal errors, but these do not explain the "until" tense of the verb inflame, so that his conjecture cannot be held. Thomas' version at that point, "Behold I guard it . . ." expresses the same idea as the Lukan verse but in a much stronger way.[10] What is a wish in Matthew is an activity in Thomas, an activity to guarantee the success of the mission. The fire in Thomas is almost certainly that conflagration in which the world perishes.[11]

---

[5] Bultmann, *History*, p. 155. Cf. Harnack, *Sayings*, pp. 85-87, who prefers the Matthean form in general as original except for Luke's δοκεῖτε.

[6] M'Neile, *Matthew*, pp. 105-106 and 147, traces them back to נתן. Similar uses of βάλλω occur in Matthew 9:17par. 26:12 and 27:6. Exactly the same difference in wording between Matthew and Luke as in this passage occurs in Matthew 25:27 (βαλεῖν) and Luke 19:23 (ἔδωκας).

[7] Plummer, *Luke*, p. 335; Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, p. 109.

Schrage sees Saying 16 as a conflation of the versions of Matthew 10:34-36/Luke 12:51-53.[12] With Luke Thomas supposedly agrees in witnessing to "think," "divisions," and "father-son, son-father." With Matthew Thomas shares "to cast," "sword," and a repetition of the "I have come." He finds no traces of a pre-synoptic tradition, arguing especially that Luke's "give peace" is more original than Matthew's "cast peace." In view of the fact that they are probably translational variants, this argument is not very satisfactory. He also argues along the lines of Harnack that Luke's "division" in v. 51 is secondary because it is a more abstract term than Matthew's sword. If, however, the saying came to be used by the Church primarily as a word of comfort in times of persecution a là Matthew, such a change from the abstract to the concrete might well be expected so that division may be more original in spite of its abstractness. The mixing of these two in Thomas plus the addition of fire and war are due to the lateness of the oral tradition on which Thomas is based.

---

[8] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 49-51.

[9] There are no such considerations here, however, so that the question as to sources must indeed be left open.

[10] Kasser, L'Évangile selon Thomas, p. 43.

[11] Haenchen, Botschaft, p. 64.

[12] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 57-61.

The attempt to link Thomas' use of the word think to Luke's δοκεῖτε is a failure even for Schrage, as there is no proof that it is a Lukan word. In truth, of course, the opposite is the case. If anything is secondary, it is Matthew's "Do not think" which he used earlier in 5:17. Schrage also ignores the fact that the whole opening sentence is quite different in Thomas. First of all, it witnesses to the Greek word τάχα found in neither Synoptic passage. Secondly, it supplies an impersonal subject "men" for the word think. Both of these changes alter the mood of this introductory sentence considerably as it is no longer a charge to the Church not to doubt Jesus. It is, rather, an expression of prophetic self-consciousness. Thus, it would seem that Thomas presents here a more likely original introduction to the saying than do either Matthew or Luke.

Schrage completely errs when he claims the omission of the Lukan trait ἀπὸ τὸ νῦν in v. 52 proves nothing. It is exactly this sort of addition that we should find if Luke was Thomas' source. For example, the Luke-sa reads: ϫⲓⲛ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ for ἀπὸ τὸ νῦν.[13] Its absence here combined with the evidence just discussed indicates that

---

[13] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 57.

Thomas was not copying Luke's text at this point. A further indication of this is the fact that Thomas also does not share the repetition of the word divided which in Luke 12:52 may also be due to the Evangelist. The arithmetic of Luke 12:52 is based on the fact that in such a household the mother is the same person as the mother-in-law. Thus, the older generation, father and mother, is opposed by the younger generation, daughter, son and his wife. Since the passage is developed on Micah 7:1-6, these arithmetic calculations cannot be assigned to Luke himself.

Matthew 10:34-36	Luke 12:49, 51-53	Thomas 10 and 16
	[49] Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ	[10] ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲁⲉⲓⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲱϩ̅ⲧ ⲉϫⲛ̅
	τὴν γῆν, καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη	ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ, ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ϯⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ
	ἀνήφθη.	ϣⲁⲛⲧⲉϥϫⲉⲣⲟ
[34] μὴ νομίσητε	[51] δοκεῖτε	[16] ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓⲥ ϫⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲁ ⲉⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ
ὅτι ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην	ὅτι εἰρήνην παρεγενόμην	ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ϫⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲉⲓⲉⲓ ⲉⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲛⲟⲩ
ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν	δοῦναι ἐν τῇ γῇ; οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν,	ⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲉϫⲙ̅ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉ
εἰρήνην ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν.	ἀλλ' ἢ διαμερισμόν. [52] ἔσον-	ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲉⲓⲉⲓ ⲁⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲛ̅ϩⲛ̅
	ται γὰρ ἀπὸ τὸ νῦν πέντε ἐν ἑνὶ	ⲡⲱⲣϫ ⲉϫⲛ̅ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲟⲩⲕⲱϩⲧ ⲟⲩⲥⲏϥⲉ
	οἴκῳ διαμεμερισμένοι, τρεῖς ἐπὶ	ⲟⲩⲡⲟⲗⲉⲙⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲛ̅ ϯⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ
	δυσὶν καὶ δύο ἐπὶ τρισίν [53] δια-	ϩⲛ̅ ⲟⲩⲏⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ ϣⲟⲙⲧ ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ
[35] ἦλθον γὰρ διχά-	μερισθήσονται, πατὴρ	ⲉϫⲛ̅ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉϫⲛ̅ ϣⲟⲙⲧ· ⲡⲉⲓ
σαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς	ἐπὶ υἱῷ καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί,	ⲱⲧ ⲉϫⲙ̅ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ
αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς	μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατέρα καὶ θυγά-	ⲉϫⲙ̅ ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ.
μητρὸς αὐτῆς	τηρ ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα, πενθερὰ	
καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς	ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφη	
αὐτῆς, [36] καὶ ἐχθροὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώ	ἐπὶ τὴν πενθεράν.	
που οἱ οἰκιακοὶ αὐτοῦ.		
		ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲱϩⲉ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲟⲩ
		ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲛⲁⲭⲟⲥ.

CHAPTER XVI

CONDITIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP

Matthew 10:37-39, Luke 14:26-27

and Sayings 55 and 101

This pericope contains sayings which in their Synoptic forms stress the necessity of complete allegiance to Christ. Bultmann shows that Luke has in general preserved the more primary form of the saying.[1] In the first saying it is clear that Matthew's version which says that one cannot love father and mother more than Jesus, could have developed out of the version given by Luke, which says that one must "hate" them in order to be a disciple. Manson correctly points out that this interpretation of the word hate by Matthew is a valid one, since the word hate in the Old Testament often means "to love less than."[2] Luke's version, nevertheless, also possesses some secondary characteristics in that the parallelism of father/mother, son/daughter has been broken up by the inclusion of other loved ones in the list of those to be hated. These additions were probably made under the influence of Mark 10:29par.[3]

Luke's version of the second saying also preserves some primary elements since it preserves the more primitive "he is not able to be my disciple" as over against Matthew's "he is not worthy of me." Bultmann feels that the Lukan form in general is primary with the exception of the reflexive ἑαυτοῦ; Klostermann, however, prefers the first part of Matthew's version.[4]

---

[1] Bultmann, History, pp. 160f.

[2] Manson, Sayings, p. 131.

[3] Cf. M'Neile, Matthew, p. 148.

Because both Evangelists offer this combination of sayings in the same order, it seems clear that they had already been joined together in Q. Klostermann points out that these sayings were joined in Q with the previous Matthean pericope, Divisions within Households, by the catchwords father/mother.

Thomas Saying 55 reads:

> Jesus said: He who does not hate his father and his mother will not be able to be my disciple and he who does not take up his cross as I have shall not be one who is worthy of me.

Thomas Saying 101 reads:

> He who does not hate his father and his mother as I have will not be able to be my disciple and he who does not love his father and his mother as I have will not be able to be any disciple, for my mother . . . , but my true mother gave me the life.

The arguments that Thomas is dependent are once again based on the premise that Thomas' methodology was that of combining the texts of Matthew and Luke. In the case of Saying 55 Schrage finds only one agreement with Matthew, that one being the obvious "worthy of me."[5] He writes:

> If one could still vacillate about whether the μισεῖν does or does not provide a direct route from Thomas to the pre-synoptic sources since the μισεῖν is more surely original, then the taking over of the εἶναι μου ἄξιος as well as of εἶναι μου (μοι) μαθητής can hardly be understood other than as dependence on Matthew or Luke; it

---

[4] Klostermann, *Matthäusevangelium*, p. 92.

[5] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, pp. 120-123.

> is one and the same whether Luke or Matthew are here judged as primary; since Thomas uses ἄξιος which only Matthew uses for this saying as well as μαθητής which only Luke uses for this saying, he must at least know one of the two.[6]

He purports to find corroborating evidence in the Coptic versions for this conclusion. Thomas' translation of the genitive μου with the dative preposition ⲛⲁⲉⲓ is the same as Luke-sa. This may show some influence of Luke-sa on the Coptic Thomas, but it has no value in determining Thomas' sources since both Luke and Matthew offer the genitive reading.[7] Grant-Freedman suggest that the clause "as I do" which is added by Thomas may be a reflection of John 14:17 where Jesus carries his own cross.[8]

Saying 101 is a doublet of Saying 55. That part of its text which is parallel to the Lukan account of hating is almost identical with Saying 55. Its additional material seems clearly to be a more fully developed gnostic interpretation of the saying: hate this world, love the spiritual.[9]

---

[6] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 120f.

[7] He presents much evidence to show that change of case is not necessary. At the same time he also show that sy witnesses a dative here as do John-sa 8:31 and 13:35 in similar expression, so that the possibility of a dative in the Greek Thomas remains, especially since its origin was in Syria. Thomas' second dative with ἄξιος indicates only that the Coptic translation was influenced by the expression he had already translated. It tells us nothing about the source of the Greek Thomas. H. W. Bartsch, NTS, VI(1960), 253-254, arguing against Quispel who sees these datives as semitisms, tries to negate their value in another way. Since the saying is understood in non-semitic terms, he holds that the semitisms are of little value. Just the opposite might well be the case, however. That the idiom was retained in a new Sitz im Leben in which it was not understood at least serves to show that it was not a creation of that new use of the saying. It could easily, therefore, show that Thomas' text bears vestiges of a tradition other than that contained in our Gospels.

[8] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, pp. 163-164.

[9] Cf. Haenchen, Botschaft, p. 58; Kasser, L'Évangile selon Thomas,

Schrage's argument from Thomas' use of ἄξιος/μαθητής proves only that Thomas knew both conclusions to this saying. Only if one of these conclusions was due to the editorial work of the Synoptic Evangelists, could we be certain that Thomas used their work as his sources. Since they are not editorial in nature, no such judgment can be made. Such readings suggest that Thomas' text may represent a very late stage in the oral tradition, a stage in which several versions of the saying had been blended together into an oral conflation.

Thomas' agreement with Luke in adding brothers/sisters to the list of those to be hated should provide the best evidence for Thomas' dependence on Luke, since those words may be editorial additions.[10] If they are, then Grant-Freedman's suggestion that Thomas omitted Luke's reference to wife and child because a gnostic would have neither provides a fairly plausible explanation for Thomas' text.[11] It is not clear, however, that the differences in Luke's text are due to the hand of Luke himself. Several things, in fact, show that we cannot attribute intentionality to such a change by Luke, so that we may not call these changes editorial traits. One, what prejudice compelled Luke to leave out the son/daughter combination of Q if he simply altered Q's list of relatives? None can be cited. Two, from what source did he obtain his additions? Mark 10:29-30par give possible sources, but no

---

p. 112; Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, p. 137; Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, pp. 189-190; Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 122-123.

[10] Bultmann, History, p. 160, writes: "In addition Luke has altered the list of relatives . . ." By this he may mean that the additions are editorial; he may, however, simply be using Luke as a shorthand for Luke's text. Whatever his meaning, the appearance of the list in Thomas reopens the case for further study.

[11] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 163.

one of them gives all of Luke's additions: Luke 18:29-30 omits sisters; Matthew and Mark omit wife. If we could see that he had simply added his Luke 18 list, or Matthew's, or Mark's, to the one in Luke 14, then it would be clearly his editorial work. As it stands, however, those additions may simply be the result of secondary expansion in the tradition. Three, this latter possibility is strengthened by the existence in our Synoptic Gospels of seven similar but different lists of relatives: Matthew 10:34-36, Luke 12:51-53, Matthew 10:37-39, Luke 14:25-27, Matthew 19:29/Mark 10:29-30/Luke 18:29-30.[12] Four, Thomas uses the lists of relatives in a different manner than does Luke. Luke places all of them together in one long list; Thomas has two parallel sayings, one for each pair of relatives and each one ending "he cannot be my disciple" (the second member of Saying 55 ends with "worthy of me"). This formal difference indicates an independent secondary development of the saying by Thomas' oral sources, rather than a deletion of material from Luke's Gospel. Therefore, in spite of the attractiveness of Grant-Freedman's suggestion, these additions to the list of relatives as preserved by Thomas do not show his dependence on the Synoptic Gospels either.

When one studies the framework into which these sayings were placed

---

[12]

Mt. 10:34-36	Luke 12:51-53	Mt. 19:29	Mark 10:29-30	Luke 18:29-30
man/father daughter/mother daughter-in-law/mother-in-law	father against son mother against daughter mother-in-law against daughter-in law	houses brothers sisters father mother children lands	house brothers sisters mother father children lands	house wife brothers parents children

by Matthew and Luke, he finds no evidence to support the view that Thomas was aware of their work. The Matthean order, which is in part Q, is clearly not followed by Thomas. He gives the material from Divisions within a Household in Sayings 10 and 16 as discussed above. He has no parallels to the next two Matthean pericopes about the Rewards of Discipleship (Matthew 10:40-42) and about John the Baptist's Question and Jesus' Answer. He gives parallels to Jesus' Witness concerning John (Matthew 11:7-19) but in Sayings 78 and 46 so that there is no evidence of Matthew's order in Thomas.[13] A similar result comes from examining the Lukan framework. Saying 64, the Parable of the Great Feast, gives the material Luke placed immediately before this pericope. Thomas has no parallels to the rest of Luke 14, and when he gives a parallel to the Parable of the Lost Sheep it comes in Saying 107.[14]

---

[13] Thomas' Sayings arranged in Matthew's order appear this way: 10, 16, 55, and 101, 78, 46.

[14] Thomas' Sayings in Luke's order appear this way: 64, 55 and 101, 107.

Matthew 10:37	Luke 14:26	Thomas 55	Thomas 101
	[26]εἴ τις ἔρ-	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ	
[37]ὁ φιλῶν	χεται πρός με καὶ οὐ μισ-	ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲙⲉⲥⲧⲉ	ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲙⲉⲥⲧⲉ
πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὑπὲρ	εῖ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ	ⲡⲉϥⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲁⲛ ⲙⲛ̅	ⲡⲉϥⲉⲓ[ⲱⲧ ⲁ]ⲛ ⲙⲛ̅
ἐμὲ οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος.	τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὴν γυ-	ⲧⲉϥⲙⲁⲁⲩ	ⲧⲉϥⲙⲁⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲁϩⲉ
καὶ ὁ φιλῶν	ναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ		
υἱὸν ἢ θυγατέρα ὑπὲρ	τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τὰς		
ἐμὲ	ἀδελφάς, ἔτι τε καὶ τὴν		
οὐκ	ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ, οὐ δύνα-	ϥⲛⲁϣ ⲣ̅	ϥⲛⲁϣ ⲣ̅
ἔστιν μου ἄξιος.	ται εἶναι μου μαθητής.	ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲙ[ⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲁⲛ
		ⲛ̅ϥⲙⲉⲥⲧⲉ ⲛⲉϥⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲙⲛ̅	
		ⲛⲉϥⲥⲱⲛⲉ	ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲙⲣ̅ⲣⲉ
			ⲡⲉ[ϥ]ⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲁⲛ [ⲙ]ⲛ̅ ⲧⲉϥ
			ⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁϩⲉ ϥⲛⲁϣ ⲣ̅
			ⲙ[ⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛⲁ]ⲉⲓ ⲁⲛ ⲧⲁ
			ⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁ[
			ⲉⲃ]ⲟⲗ [ⲧⲁⲙⲁⲁⲩ] ⲇⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲉ
			ⲁⲥϯ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲙ̅ⲡⲱⲛϩ

Matthew 10:38	Luke 14:27	Thomas 55	Thomas 101
[38]καὶ ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου, οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος.	[27]ὅστις οὐ βατάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναται εἶναι μου μαθητής.	ⲛ̄ϥϥⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲥ⳨ⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϩⲉ ϥⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛⲁⲝⲓⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ.	

CHAPTER XVII

CHRIST'S TESTIMONY TO THE BAPTIST

Matthew 11:7-11, Luke 7:24-28, and Sayings 78 and 46

This passage is part of a longer Q pericope in which the Church's belief as to the relationship of John the Baptist and Jesus is exposed. Bultmann, working to some extent on the basis of Dibelius' work, feels that the saying contained in Matthew11:7-9, 11apar may be a genuine saying of Jesus.[1] The Old Testament quote of v. 10par is an intrusion into the saying, whereas v. 11b represents a polemical addition of the Church.

The differences between the two Synoptic versions are quite minor.[2] The two introductory verses, Matthew 11:7a and Luke 7:24a, use somewhat different vocabularies to tell that what is coming next was said after John's disciples had left Jesus to carry his reply back to John. In 7:25 of Luke there is after the adjective "soft" a noun "clothes," which is missing in Matthew. Later in the same verse Luke reads "those who are in soft clothes" where Matthew says "those who wear soft (clothes)." Luke's "palaces" is also better Greek than Matthew's "in the houses of kings." Luke's reading οὐδείς ἐστιν avoids the

---

[1] Bultmann, History, pp. 164-165. Cf. Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte, p. 245, n. 1; and Manson, Sayings, pp. 67f.

[2] Cf. M'Neile, Matthew, pp. 153-154; Klostermann, Matthäusevanglium, pp. 96-97; Klostermann, Lukasevangelium, pp. 90-91.

Hebraism of Matthew's ἐγήγερται. Since Luke elsewhere uses that idiom (Luke 3:8, Acts 13:22), we cannot be at all certain that this change was due to him. We cannot, in fact, attribute with certainty any of these differences to either Evangelist, although Luke's readings do appear to be due to a desire for better Greek.

Thomas Saying 78 reads:

> Jesus said: Why have you come out into the field? To see a reed which is shaken by the wind? And to see a man who is clothed in soft garments? Behold, your kings and great men are those who are clothed in soft clothing and they will not be able to know the truth.

Thomas Saying 46 reads:

> Jesus said: From Adam until John the Baptist among those born of women there is not one who is higher than John the Baptist, so that his eyes will not be broken. But I have said: Whoever among you becomes as a little one shall know the kingdom and shall be higher than John.

There is no editorial evidence in Saying 78 for those who claim that Thomas is a mixture of the texts of Matthew and Luke. The only possible relationship is that Thomas' version does repeat "soft clothes" instead of soft clothing in the part of the saying about kings. Schrage attempts to find agreements with the Sahidic versions as evidence and finds such things as agreement in adding the definite article to ⲧⲏⲩ (wind) and the omission by Thomas and Luke-sa of the phrase "and in luxury" which is in the Greek text of Luke.[3] These things show some influence on Thomas' text by the other Coptic translations. Thomas' differences from the Sahidic versions,[4] especially that concerning the place of the infinitive "to see" in the sentence, actually show that Thomas is independent of them, as Wilson says.[5] Wilson is wrong, nevertheless, in saying that such a variation is possible only on the basis of a written MS. The Greek can clearly take either punctuation, as the modern editions admit, so that an oral tradition may well have understood it as a question also.[6]

---

[3] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 161-162.

[4] The Sahidic versions translate τί as what; therefore, the infinitive "to see" must be translated in the first part of the sentence. This corresponds to the understanding behind the punctuation followed by Aland. Thomas interprets τί as "why" so that infinitive must come

The differences between Thomas' version of the saying and that of the Synoptic Gospels actually support the view that he used a source other than Matthew and Luke. It is possible to understand the removal of the saying from the Baptist context as necessary for its general gnostic interpretation, and Schrage gives a well-documented case for this.[7] Such reasoning, however, does not explain why Thomas would have completely separated Sayings 78 and 46 if he had found them together in his sources (Matthew and Luke). Such a separation suggests that the two sayings about the Baptist may have circulated separately. This would mean that the two would have been combined into one saying in Q. The secondary changes to "kings and great men" suggest a long period of oral transmission.

Although Saying 46 is quite different from the Synoptic saying,

---

in the second part of the sentence. This corresponds to the understanding behind the alternate punctuation offered by Aland for the Greek.

[5] Wilson, Studies, pp. 63f.

[6] Cf. Matthew 11:9 and Luke 7:26 where the only difference is the position of the infinitive, yet Matthew and Luke are punctuated differently by Aland. Here, too, either puctuation could apply to either Synoptic passage.

[7] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 162-164.

several writers are confident that Thomas used Matthew and Luke as his sources.[8] No one produces any definite evidence other than that of the general similarity of the sayings. Grant-Freedman's suggestion that the phrase "from Adam until John the Baptist" is based on Matthew 11:12's "from the days of John the Baptist until now" is of no value since this is a typical way of computing time.[9]

It is Schrage who points out the only possibilities for such a claim: The apposition of "the Baptist" to John in agreement with Matthew and the use of ⲙⲛ̄ "there is not" instead of Matthew's ἐγήγερται. He also finds a link to the Matthew-sa since both Thomas and it translate "among those born of women" in the same but not usual way.[10] This last point is subject to the same criticism as all the rest of these agreements with the Sahidic: It really tells us nothing about the sources of the Greek text of Thomas. The use of ⲙⲛ̄ tells nothing either since we cannot definitely attribute Luke's οὐδείς ἐστιν to him.[11] The same must be said for the use of the appositive "the Baptist."[12]

Besides the argument from the order of the sayings as made above, there is not much to be given as evidence that the saying is independent.

---

[8] Cf. Wilson, Studies, pp. 61f; Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, pp. 223-229; Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, pp. 158f.

[9] Other New Testament examples are Matthew 1:17 (3 times), Matthew 23:35, Luke 11:51, Matthew 11:12, and Romans 5:14.

[10] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 107-108.

[11] Cf. The similar argument above on pp. 22-23.

[12] The term appears, for example, in Luke 7:20 and 7:33 but not in our verses, 24-28. It also appears in Luke 9:19; Mark 6:25 and 8:28; Matthew 3:1; 11:12; 14:2,8: 16:14 and 17:13.

Perhaps the most striking thing is the way the saying has been developed from a number of elements which have possibilities with other sayings in the tradition. The interpetation of *μικρότερός ἐστιν* as becoming a child is such a development, as is the reference to Adam. Such things indicate a long oral transmission in a gnosticizing milieu rather than a deliberate mixing of New Testament texts. It is doubtful the lack of a reference to John as the greatest of prophets is of importance for the question of sources since it evidently was an integral part of the saying in the tradition.

Matthew 11:7-9	Luke 7:24-26	Thomas 78
[7]Τούτων δὲ πορευομένων	[24]Ἀπελθόντων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων Ἰω-	
ἤξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγειν	άννου ἤξατο λέγειν	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ
τοῖς ὄχλοις περὶ Ἰωάννου.	πρὸς τοὺς ὄχλους περὶ Ἰωάννου·	
τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον	τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον	ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲧⲥⲱϣⲉ
θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου	θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου	ⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲩⲕⲁϣ ⲉϥⲕⲓⲙ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲓⲧⲙ̅
σαλευόμενον, [8]ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθα-	σαλευόμενον; [25]ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθα-	ⲡⲧⲏⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ
τε ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς	τε ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς	ⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲩⲣ[ⲱⲙⲉ ⲉϩ]ⲛ̅ϣⲧⲏⲛ
ἠμφιεσμένον; ἰδοὺ οἱ	ἱματίοις ἠμφιεσμένον; ἰδοὺ οἱ	ⲉⲩϭⲏⲛ ϩⲓⲱⲱⲃ· [ⲉⲓⲥ
μαλακὰ φοροῦντες ἐν	ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ	ⲛ̅ⲉⲧⲛ̅]ⲣ̅ⲣⲱⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ̅ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲉⲅⲓⲥⲧⲁⲛⲟⲥ
τοῖς οἴκοις τῶν βασιλέ-	ὑπάρχοντες ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις	ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲛ[ϣⲧⲏ]ⲛ [ⲉⲧ]ϭⲏⲛ ϩⲓⲱⲟⲩ
ων. [9]ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε; προφή-	εἰσίν. [26]ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε	
την ἰδεῖν; ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν,	ἰδεῖν; πρφήτην; ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν,	
καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου.	καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου.	
		ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉ[ⲛⲁ]ϣ ⲥⲟⲩⲛ ⲧⲙⲉ ⲁⲛ.

Matthew 11:11a	Luke 7:28	Thomas 46
[11a] ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,	[28] λέγω ὑμῖν,	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ
οὐκ ἐγήγερται ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν μείζων Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ	μείζων ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν Ἰωάννου οὐδείς ἐστιν·	ϫⲓⲛ ⲁⲇⲁⲙ ϣⲁ ⲓ̈ⲱϩⲁⲛⲛⲏⲥ ⲡⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲥⲧⲏⲥ ϩⲛ̅ ⲛ̅ϫⲡⲟ ⲛ̅ⲛϩⲓⲟⲙⲉ ⲙⲛ̅ ⲡⲉⲧϫⲟⲥⲉ ⲁⲓ̈ⲱϩⲁⲛⲛⲏⲥ ⲡⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲥⲧⲏⲥ ϣⲓⲛⲁ ϫⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲱϭⲡ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲛⲉϥⲃⲁⲗ ⲁⲉⲓϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ϫⲉ
ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν.	ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν.	ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ϩⲛ̅ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̅ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛ̅ⲕⲟⲩⲉⲓ ϥⲛⲁⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲁⲩⲱ ϥⲛⲁϫⲓⲥⲉ ⲁⲓ̈ⲱϩⲁⲛⲛⲏⲥ

CHAPTER XVIII

JESUS' THANKSGIVING TO THE FATHER

Matthew 11:25-27, Luke 10:21-22 and Saying 61

This pericope contains two sayings of Jesus, to which Matthew in verses 28-30 adds a third. The different nature of the sayings shows that they have been placed together: The first is an Aramaic saying, the second appears to be an Hellenistic revelation saying, the third a wisdom saying.[1]

One sentence from Logion 61 is somewhat of a parallel to Matthew 11:27par. Since Matthew and Luke give identical texts for this part of the saying, and since the sentence is so short, no conclusion of literary dependence can be drawn.

Schrage assumes dependence but agrees that no sure conclusion is possible.[2] The fact that Thomas agrees with the Sahidic, Boharic and Achmimic translations in putting *ⲛⲁⲉⲓ* after the verb indicates to him that he is correct since that order is not necessary for Coptic. He also conjectures that Thomas originally agreed word for word with these other Coptic translations and shows how the changes could have occurred. Even if the texts were exactly the same, however, it would prove nothing in so short a passage. Köster makes the only kind of judgment that is possible in such a situation: The idea is so general that all we can say is that they express the same general idea.[3]

---

[1] Bultmann, *History*, p. 159.

[2] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, p. 128.

---

[3] Köster, Synoptische Überlieferung, p. 249.

Matthew 11:27a	Luke 10:22a	Thomas 61 (Plate 91, 29-30)
[27] Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρός μου,	[22] πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου,	ⲁⲩϯ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲁ ⲡⲁⲉⲓⲱⲧ

CHAPTER XIX

COME UNTO ME

Matthew 11:28-30 and Saying 90

This saying is the third in the series of which we began a discussion in the previous section. Bultmann's interpretation is that it is not a call to repentance but a showing of a more profitable way to one "who cares and strives in vain."[1] Klostermann supports Bultmann's view that this saying is a wisdom saying which has been attributed to Jesus in the tradition.[2] No wisdom book contains this saying, but Sirach 51:23 contains enough similarities to show that the saying is a wisdom saying.[3] M'Neile puts it well when he refers to Matthew 11:25ff. as echoes of Sirach 51:23-27.[4] The figure of the yoke was commonly used in Jewish writings to refer to the law, and Manson argues against taking the saying as wisdom material because it speaks of freedom from the law. It would seem, rather, that this contrast between the law and Jesus was exactly the point made by the tradition in using the saying in the first place.

The saying is preserved only by Matthew, and there are no discernable editorial traits in it. There does seem to be some play on words. M'Neile suggests that this may have been so in Aramaic with the words rest, gentle and light all coming from the same root.[5] In the Greek a similar word play occurs in the use of πεφορτισμένοι in the first part of the saying and φορτίον in the second.

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 159

[2] Klostermann, Matthäusevangelium, p. 102.

[3] Matthew 11:19par shows clearly that wisdom was in the background for this section of Q.

[4] M'Neile, Matthew, p. 166.

Thomas Saying 90 reads:

> Jesus said: Come to me, for easy is my yoke and my lordship is gentle and you shall find rest for yourselves.

Grant-Freedman hold that gnostic motives lay behind the shortening and alteration of Matthew's text by Thomas.[6] He first of all wanted to address the saying to gnostics, not to those who labored and burdened. Secondly, he wished to emphasize the word rest, not the yoke. As Schrage points out in refuting a similar claim by Montefiori, the gnostics did elsewhere quote the saying in its entirety, and they did not consider themselves to be without burdens.[7] Schrage himself feels that the differences between Thomas and Matthew are the result of free citation. These differences are: One, the substitution of "lordship" for "burden," two, a difference in order which finds verse 30 coming before verse 29c, the substitution of "meek or gentle" for "light"; four, the use of the pronoun ὑμῖν for ταῖς ψυχαῖς. He rightly finds no proof of dependency in any of these nor even in the other Sahidic translations. Nonetheless, he concludes: "In spite of the lack of clear proof, it appears most probable that this saying of the Lord has reached him (Thomas) through the mediation of Matthew."[8]

---

[5] M'Neile, Matthew, p. 167.

[6] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 184. So also Wilson, Studies, pp. 57f.

[7] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 173, n. 5.

Since there are no editorial traits in the passage, there is indeed no proof for the dependency which some assume. To be sure, the same saying is obviously transmitted in both Thomas and Matthew. Unless Matthew created the saying, however, this similarity proves nothing about dependence.[9] The arguments from the order of Thomas' sayings does support the opposite view that Matthew was not Thomas' source. Thomas uses four sayings or parts of sayings found also in Matthew 11, but the order in which he uses them (78, 46, 61b, 90) betrays no knowledge of Matthew's arrangement of them. Thus, there is no editorial evidence at all that Thomas' source for Saying 90 was Matthew's Gospel.

---

[8] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 173.

[9] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 172-173, mentions that Hirsch considers this to be so. The similarities of the whole passage with Sirach 51 would seem to negate the possibility of that being so.

Matthew 11:28-30	Thomas 90
[28]Δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲁⲙⲏⲉⲓⲧⲛ̅ ϣⲁⲣⲟⲉⲓ
καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, κάγω αναπαύσω ὑμᾶς.	
[29]ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς	ϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲭⲣⲏⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲁⲛⲁϩⲃ· ⲁⲩⲱ
καὶ μάθετε ἀπ' εμοῦ, ὅτι πραΰς	ⲧⲁⲙⲛ̅ⲧϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲟⲩⲣⲙ̅ⲣⲁϣ
εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, καὶ	ⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ
εὑρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν.	ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲉ ⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̅
ὁ γὰρ ζυγός μου χρηστὸς καὶ φορτίον	
μου ἐλαφρόν ἐστιν.	

CHAPTER XX

ON COLLUSION WITH SATAN

Matthew 12:29, Mark 3:27, Luke 11:21, and Saying 35

The saying about plundering of the strong man's house is the only part of the much longer pericope Mark 3:22-27par which has a parallel in Thomas. The Marcan context of the saying comes in verse 22 in which Jesus is accused of having a demon first and then of casting out demons by the power of Beelzebul. In Matthew and Luke (the Q parallels) the accusation is only that Jesus casts out demons by Beelzebul. The basic answer in both accounts is that a kingdom or a house divided against itself cannot stand. In Mark 3 the strong man saying is appended directly to that answer while in Matthew and Luke (Q) two other sayings intervene. The saying attached after the strong man (Matthew 12:30par) was probably also in Q. From these observations Bultmann concludes that "we can clearly trace the process of expanding an original apophthegm by the addition of particular sayings right back behind Q and Mark."[1]

Of the strong man saying itself there are also two versions. Matthew and Mark give substantially the same one while Luke offers a different account. Luke's version is generally assigned to Q.[2] Matthew's version differs from that of Mark chiefly in that it asks a question, "Or how can one enter the house . . . ?" whereas Mark's account is in the statement form, "But no one is able to enter the house . . ." This change is most probably due to Matthew's revision of Mark. No other editorial traces are visible outside of that in the composition of the Marcan and Q pericopes themselves.[3]

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 14.

[2] Manson, Sayings, p. 83; Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1957), p. 242.

Saying 35 of Thomas reads:

> It is not possible for one to enter the house of the strong (man) and take him by force, unless he binds his hands, then he will demolish his house.

Thomas' version of this saying is actually very close to that in Mark as Schrage's analysis shows.[4] He rightly concludes that from this agreement we cannot prove Thomas' use of Matthew or Mark. The only major differences are the addition of the prepositional phrase "by force," the addition of the direct object "his hands" for the verb bind, and the change from "plunder his goods" to "take him (it)."[5] Although Quispel tries to see in these evidence of a different translation from Aramaic,[6] Bartsch and Schrage are more probably correct in viewing them as secondary developments.[7]

Schrage does try to support the probability of dependence for this saying on the basis of some striking agreements between Thomas and

---

[3] Taylor, *Mark*, p. 241, mentions that Mark uses *πρῶτον* quite frequently but it cannot with certainty be assigned to him here.

[4] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, p. 89.

[5] Grant-Freedman's suggestion, *Secret Sayings*, p. 151, that this addition comes from Luke's *πανοπλία* cannot be taken seriously since force of one kind or another would be necessary to overcome any strong man.

[6] Quispel, *NTS*, V(1959), 280.

[7] Bartsch, *NTS*, VI(1960), 255-256.

Matthew-sa. Both translate εἰ μὴ as ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ, and both omit the καί before τότε. He also found one Sahidic MS, number 111, which agrees with Thomas in omitting the ⲛ̄ϣⲟⲣⲡ = πρῶτον. These similarities may prove that Thomas' Coptic is related in some way to Matthew-sa, but they say nothing about the ultimate source of the Greek text of Thomas.

The argument from context is one which supports the position that Thomas 35 represents an independent version of the saying. Thomas' gnostic prejudice would have prevented him from using the exorcism sayings which make up the central portion of the pericope. That a similar judgment can be rendered against Matthew 12:30par is not so certain. What is clear is that neither Matthew nor Luke's order in general was being observed at this point in Thomas. Sayings 61b and 90 are from Matthew 11, Sayings 35 and 99 from Matthew 12. Saying 61b is from Luke 10 as are Sayings 73, 14 and 39(to be treated later), from Luke 11 come Sayings 35 and 79 (also treated later), and from Luke 12 Sayings 72, 63, 21, 103, 10, 16, and 91.

The secondary developments within the saying also support the arguments for independence, as they betray a longer period of oral transmission than do the Synoptic versions. The fact that Thomas' Coptic translation is different from, as well as similar to, the Sahidic also points to the fact that it was originally a translation independent of it.

Matthew 12:29	Mark 3:27	Thomas 35	Luke 11:21-22
[29] ἢ πῶς δύναται	[27] ἀλλ᾽ οὐ δύναται	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲙⲛ̄ ϭⲟⲙ	
τις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν	οὐδεὶς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ	ⲛⲧⲉⲟⲩⲁ ⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲏⲉⲓ	
οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ καὶ τὰ	ἰσχυροῦ εἰσελθὼν τὰ	ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲱⲱⲣⲉ ⲛ̄ϥϫⲓⲧϥ ⲛ̄ϫⲛⲁϩ	
σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἁρπάσαι,	σκεύη αὐτοῦ διαρπάσαι,		
			[21] ὅταν ὁ ἰσχυρὸς καθωπλισ-
			μένος φυλάσσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ
			αὐλήν, ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐστὶν τὰ
ἐὰν μὴ	ἐὰν μὴ	ⲉⲓⲙⲏⲧⲓ	ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ· [22] ἐπὰν δὲ
πρῶτον δήσῃ	πρῶτον τὸν	ⲛ̄ϥⲙⲟⲩⲣ	ἰσχυρότερος αὐτοῦ ἐπελ-
τὸν ἰσχυρόν;	ἰσχυρὸν δήσῃ,	ⲛ̄ⲛⲉϥϭⲓϫ	θὼν νικήσῃ αὐτόν, τὴν
			πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἴρει,
καὶ	καὶ		ἐφ᾽ ᾗ ἐπεποίθει, καὶ
τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ	τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ	ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ϥⲛⲁⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ	τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ
διαρπάσει.	διαρπάσει.	ⲙⲡⲉϥⲏⲉⲓ	διαδίδωσιν.

CHAPTER XXI

THE SIN AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT

Matthew 12:31-32, Mark 3:28-30, Luke 12:10
and Saying 44

The accounts of Mark and of Matthew/Luke (Q) all agree that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit cannot be forgiven. According to the Marcan pericope all other sins committed by man (the sons of men) can be forgiven; according to Q (Matthew 12:32--Luke 12:10) any word against the Son of Man (Jesus) can be forgiven. Since the Q version is thus based on a misunderstanding of Son of Man which must have originally meant "a man" here, Mark's version is the more original in this respect.[1] Bornkamm shows that Matthew (and Luke) could make use of the Q version of the saying only because of the view that sins committed before Pentecost were forgivable while those after Pentecost, that is, those after the coming of the Holy Spirit, were not.[2]

Matthew in this pericope has actually followed his familiar practice of using both of his sources side by side.[3] Verse 31 is, thus, his reworking of Mark while verse 32 is evidently based on the Q version of the same saying.[4] Luke appears to have been influenced by Mark in his use of the participial phrase τῷ . . . βλασφημήσαντι as verse 10a as well as Matthew 12:32 make it relatively certain that the Q way of speaking of blasphemy was "to speak (a word) against."[5] Matthew's concluding phrase "neither in this age nor in the age to come" was probably in his version of Q. M'Neile feels that it is an expansion by Matthew of Mark's εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, but there are no reasons to support such a change by Matthew himself.[6] Eph. 1:21, as well as Mark 10:30/Luke 18:30, shows that the phrase was hardly original with him, nor are there any other places where Matthew changes Mark or Q in such a way.

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 131; Manson, Sayings, p. 110.

[2] Bornkamm-Barth-Held, Überlieferung, pp 31f. Cf. Conzelmann's agreement, The Theology of St. Luke, p. 179, n. 3.

[3] Bultmann, History, pp. 353, 362.

Thomas Saying 44 reads:

> Jesus said: He who speaks blasphemy against the Father, it shall be forgiven him, and he who speaks blasphemy against the Son, it shall be forgiven him, but he who speaks blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him either on the earth or in heaven.

Schrage's analysis of Saying 44 is not entirely accurate.[7] He is correct in showing that Thomas' version of the saying is based on the same misunderstanding of son of man as is that of the Q version. He is incorrect in saying that Thomas has no affinities with the version given us in Mark outside of those shared also in Matthew or Luke. His error lies in assuming that Thomas' third sentence about the blasphemy of the

---

[4] Taylor, Mark, pp. 242-243, correctly concludes that Matthew's πᾶσα ἁμαρτία interprets Mark's awkward ὅσα ἐὰν βλασφημήσωσιν.

[5] Cf. M'Neile, Matthew, p. 177.

[6] M'Neile, Matthew, p. 178. For the view that it was most likely in Q one can see Klostermann, Matthäusevangelium, pp. 109-110.

[7] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 98-100.

Holy Spirit is dependent on the Lukan version.[8] A look at Thomas' Coptic reveals that he offers all three statements about blasphemy in the same words: ⲡⲉⲧⲁϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲁ ... ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲕⲱ (ⲁⲛ) ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁϥ. The first half of the sentence must translate a Greek text similar only to that in Mark 3:29 ὃς δὲ ἂν βλασφημῃ: Whoever blasphemes.[9] The second half must translate (οὐκ) ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ: It shall (not) be forgiven him.[10]

Thomas' version of this saying, thus actually presents us with the same problems we have met in other sayings. The text appears to be a mixture, this time of Mark and Q. It shares its "whoever blasphemes" only with Mark but its misunderstanding of son of Man, the form of the second half of the sentence about forgiveness, and its οὔτε . . . οὔτε conclusion with Q.

This sharing does not, however, prove Thomas' dependence on either Mark or Matthew/Luke (Q). Significantly, the specifically editorial changes of Matthew and Luke are again missing from Thomas. We find neither Matthew 12:29, Matthew's version of Mark 3:28, nor Luke's τῷ ... βλασφημήσαντι. We have shown earlier that the οὔτε phrases cannot be assigned to Matthew. The arguments from Synoptic order of the sayings given in the discussion of the previous pericope also indicate that Thomas was not using our Gospels.

---

[8] Kasser, L'Évangile selon Thomas, p. 73, makes the same erroneous assumption when he gives τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι as the Greek of this sentence.

[9] W. E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, compiled with the help of many scholars (London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1939), p. 468b; Paul Kahle, Bala'izah (London: Published on Behalf of The Griffith Institute Ashmolean Museum. Oxford, by Geoffrey Cumberledge, Oxford University Press, 1954), vol. I, p. 154, shows that the omission of N in the third future (ⲡⲉⲧⲁ- ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁ) is a subachmimic feature.

[10] Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, p. 97a, says ⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ plus the dative of person means forgive.

Thomas' version of the saying represents, therefore, not a mixture of the Synoptic versions, but a third version of the same saying given by them. Q's misinterpretation of son of Man was, after all, a natural one for Greek speaking Christians to make, and it is no surprise to find it taken over in Thomas. Almost the same thing can be said for Thomas' witness to the Trinitarian formula by his reference to blasphemy against the Father: Once the saying was thought of as referring to the Son and the Spirit, it was natural to include the Father. What gnostic interpretation can be given for such blasphemy is, as Schrage says, an open question at this point. Thus, the evidence from Thomas gives support to the view already expressed by Köster:

> From the two-fold transmission of this saying by Mark and Q it follows that this saying must have been freely circulated; from the differences noted in them it follows that it was so changed in the course of transmission that it became meaningless. . . . The Didache shows many more original points than the Mark and Q form of this logion, to say nothing about Matthew. The unforgivable sin is that against the spirit of the prophecy. . . . From such a proverbial kind of saying has come later the rule of the unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit as it lies before us in a still further changed form by the synoptics.[11]

Thomas' version simply represents this process of change carried one step further. Such further changes, as we have argued earlier, indicate that Thomas derived his saying not from our Gospels but from a later stage of the oral tradition.

---

[11] Köster, Synoptische Überlieferung, pp. 216-217.

Matthew 12:31-32	Mark 3:28-29	Luke 12:10	Thomas 44
[31] Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις,	[28] Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἁμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι, ὅσα ἐὰν βλασφημήσωσιν·		ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ
ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.			ⲡⲉⲧⲁϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲁⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁϥ
[32] καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ·		[10] καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ·	ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲁϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲉⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲕⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁϥ
ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.	[29] ὃς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,	τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.	ⲡⲉⲧⲁϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲡⲡ̅ⲛ̅ⲁ̅ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲕⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁϥ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ϩⲛ̅ ⲧⲡⲉ

CHAPTER XXII

CHRIST'S REAL BRETHREN

Matthew 12:46-50, Mark 3:31-35, Luke 8:19-21
and Saying 99

Bultmann's[1] judgment that Mark 3:35 is the saying upon which this apophthegm is constructed is to be preferred over that of Dibelius[2] who sees verse 35 as a secondary conclusion to verses 31-34. Only then can a definition of "doing the will of God" be seen which satisfies the purpose of the Evangelist, namely to call his reader to become one of those who come to listen to Jesus. The debate between Schmidt, Dibelius and Bultmann over the relationship of verse 21 to the apophthegm is of no consequence for the present study.[3]

It seems clear that both Matthew and Luke reworked the Marcan account for their Gospels.[4] Matthew 12:46 summarizes Mark 3:31-32, Matthew 12:48 avoids Mark's use of ἐστιν for both Jesus' mother and brothers, and Matthew 12:50 substitutes "the will of my Father who is in heaven" for Mark's more original "the will of God."[5] Luke, on the other hand, changes the apophthegm chiefly by compressing it. A typical Lukan word παρεγένετο does appear in Luke 8:19 however. Two of the peculiarities of Luke's text are significant: One, it lacks Jesus' question "Who are my . . .?" given in Mark 3:33par; two, it combines the sentence "Behold my mother and . . ." from verse 34 and the sentence "he is my brother and . . ." from verse 35 into the one sentence "My mother and brothers are those who . . ." The conclusion of that sentence "who hear the word of God and do it" may be a Lukan editorial trait.[6] Since it reveals the growing importance of ethics as the delay of the parousia became evident, the reading may have been in Luke's sources as Matthew 7:24/Luke 6:47 (Q) show. Luke's one other change is in the position of the apophthegm as he places it after the Parable of the Sower whereas the other two place it before that parable.

---

[1] Bultmann, *History*, pp. 29-31.

[2] Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, pp. 44-45.

[3] Schmidt, *Der Rahmen*, pp. 120ff.

[4] M'Neile, *Matthew*, p. 184, suggests that Luke used a different source, but there is little evidence for Q here.

[5] M'Neile, *Matthew*, pp. 184-185.

Thomas Saying 99 reads:

> The disciples said to him: Your brothers and your mother are standing outside. He said to them: Those here who do the will of my Father, these are my brothers and my mother; they are the ones who will go into the kingdom ~~of my~~ Father.

After listing seven supposed agreements with Luke that prove Thomas' knowledge of Luke, Schrage admits that most of them could have come about independently.[7] The rest of his analysis is the best examined thus far. From Thomas' agreement with Luke in the manner of combining the two sentences of Mark 3:34-35 into one and from their common omission of the question of Jesus given in verse 33 he concludes knowledge of Luke. From Thomas' agreement with Matthew in the substitution of the phrase "the will of my Father" he concludes a knowledge of

---

[6] Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, p. 231, especially note 3.

[7] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 185-189.

Matthew.

Köster had already pointed out the same kind of agreements with regard to 2 Clem. 9, 11.[8] Following Köster's lead, Schrage concludes that Thomas' text is perhaps in this place not the mixed text he has found elsewhere but a text based on an ancient Gospel harmony. The fact that Thomas, 2 Cle., Clem. of Al., and the Ebionite Gospel all have these same similarities gives credence to a hypothesis along these lines. Even here he oversimplifies Köster's case. Köster actually offers two possible suggestions as solutions for the problem. The first is that it is due to the Gospel of the Nazareans which was openly based on Matthew and Luke and which may have had a very wide circulation. This is the option chosen by Schrage. The second, which Schrage does not mention, is that 2 Clem. could have been using a collection of sayings of Jesus which had been influenced in its formulations by the Gospel of the Nazareans.[9] The continual lack of the editorial traits of the Synoptic Evangelists in Thomas combined with the fact that Thomas' text often appears to be a mixed text, suggests that his source or sources have been influenced by contact with some kind of written source. Such a theory goes beyond the scope of this study, however.

---

[8] Köster, Synoptische Überlieferung, pp. 77-79.

[9] Wilson, Studies, pp. 115-116.

Matthew 12:46-48	Mark 3:31-34	Luke 8:19-21a	Thomas 99
[46] Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς	[31] καὶ ἔρχονται	[19] Παρεγέντο	
ὄχλοις, ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ	ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ	δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ	
καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ	καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ	καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ	
εἱστήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντες	ἔξω στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν	οὐκ ἠδύναντο συντυχεῖν	
αὐτῷ λαλῆσαι.	πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες αὐτόν.	αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον.	
	[32] καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν		
	ὄχλος, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ·	[20] ἀπηγγέλη δὲ	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ
	ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου	αὐτῷ· ἡ μήτηρ σου	ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲕⲥⲛⲏⲩ
	καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου καὶ	καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου	ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲕⲙⲁⲁⲩ
	αἱ ἀδελφαί σου ἔξω	ἑστήκασιν	ⲥⲉⲁϩⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ
	ζητοῦσίν σε.	ἔξω ἰδεῖν θέλοντές σε.	ϩⲓ ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲃⲟⲗ
[48] ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν	[33] καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς	[21] ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν	ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ
τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ· τίς ἐστιν	λέγει· τίς ἐστιν	πρὸς αὐτούς·	ⲛⲁⲩ ϫⲉ
ἡ μήτηρ μου, καὶ τίνες	ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ		
εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;	οἱ ἀδελφοί;		
[49] καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα	[34] καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς		
αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς	περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθ-		
αὐτοῦ εἶπεν· ἰδοὺ ἡ	ημένους λέγει· ἴδε ἡ		
μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ	μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ		

Matthew 12:50	Mark 3:35	Luke 8:21	2 Clem 9, 11	Thomas 44
ἀδελφοί μου.	ἀδελφοί μου.		καὶ	
			γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος·	
50 ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιή-	35 ὃς ἂν ποιή-			ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲙⲁ
σῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ	σῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ			ⲉⲓⲣⲉ ⲙⲡⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁ
πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν	θεοῦ			ⲉⲓⲱⲧ
οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου	οὗτος			
ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ	ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀ-	μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀ-	Ἀ-	ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲛⲉ ⲙⲁⲥⲛⲏⲩ
καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.	δελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν	δελφοί μου οὗτοι	δελφοί μου οὗτοι	ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲁⲙⲁⲁⲩ
		εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον	εἰσιν	
		τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούον-		
		τες καὶ ποιοῦντες		
			τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατ-	
			ρός μου.	ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲩ
				ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ
				ⲉⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲉⲓⲱⲧ

CHAPTER XXIII

THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER

Matthew 13:3-9, Mark 4:3-9, Luke 8:5-8 and Saying 9

The Parable of the Sower is given in substantially the same version by Matthew and Mark and in a somewhat shortened version by Luke. It is the first of three sections of material which Matthew, Mark and Luke all place together: the Sower, the Reason for Parables and the Interpretation of the Sower.[1] Their agreement probably means that this collection is pre-Marcan. To it Mark and Matthew add the Parable of the Mustard Seed and the conclusion that Jesus spoke only in parables to the crowd. Mark alone adds the Parable of the Tares and its interpretation, the Parable of the Leaven, the Parables of the Hidden Treasure and of the Pearl of Great Price, and the Parable of the Drag Net. Luke offers the Parable of the Mustard Seed and the Parable of the Leaven elsewhere.

The Marcan form of this parable is marked by its semitic style. In Mark 4:4 the *καὶ ἐγένετο* is a semitism, and the whole parable consists of a series of short sentences joined by *καὶ*. Only Mark's account begins with the imperative *ἀκούετε*.[2]

Matthew's version avoids some of Mark's semitic flavor. An article is added to the infinitive *σπείρειν* (Mark *σπεῖραι*) and the καὶ ἐγένετο is omitted in Matthew 13:4 (as well as in Luke 8:5). Also in verse 4 the circumstantial participle ἐλθόντα is used in place of Mark's καὶ ἦλθεν. Verses 5-8 begin not καί but δέ. Matthew also differs in using the plural (ἃ and ἄλλα) for the reference to seeds all the way through the parable whereas Mark uses the plural only for the seed sowed in the good soil and Luke uses the singular throughout.[3]

---

[1] M'Neile, *Matthew*, p. 186. Cf. Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, p. 10, n. 5; Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, pp. 190-191.

[2] Taylor, *Mark*, pp. 250, 252.

Luke's version shares some of the smoothing out process we observed in Matthew's account. It does retain the καί connective of Mark, however. These features not found in the other two accounts are also found in Luke 8:5: τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ is added as object of sow; in verse 5b the clause "and it is trampled" is added; in verse 5c the phrase "of heaven" is added to birds. Luke's reading "on rock" also differs from the "rocky ground" of the other two Evangelists. M'Neile says Luke's reading represents the original and that they have interpreted it correctly.[4] This would seem so as the difference can be understood this way while there seems to be no reason if one supposes a change from "rocky ground" to "rock." The other peculiarities of the Lukan account are the omission of the section about rapid growth of the seed falling on rock, the substitution of lack of moisture as the reason for its failure, the use of the typically Lukan phrase "in the midst of"[5] with thorns for "among thorns," and the use of the verb συμφυεῖσαι where Mark and Matthew use ἀνέβησαν.[6]

---

[3] M'Neile, *Matthew*, pp. 187-188.

[4] M'Neile, *Matthew*, p. 187.

[5] Luke 2:46, 10:3, 21:21; 22:27,55; 24:36. Acts 1:15; 2:22; 4:7; 17:22; 27:21. In Matthew the phrase occurs in 10:16; 14:6; 18:2,20. In Mark the 6:47 and 9:36.

Bultmann[7] and Jeremias[8] are agreed that the allegorical interpretation given the parable in the Synoptic accounts is secondary. Their common reasoning is based on the specifically Christian use of λόγος as a technical term, on the use of unusual vocabulary in the passage, and on the fact that it misses the point of the story. Bultmann agrees with Jeremias that the point of the parable is not growth but the contrast between the two periods of planting and harvesting.[9] He disagrees with him on trying to identify those two periods as the time of the disciples and the final judgment.

The concluding formula of the parable itself "he who has ears to hear" is also a secondary addition.[10]

Thomas Saying 9 reads:

> Jesus said: Behold the sower went out, he filled his hand, he threw. Some fell on the road, the birds came, they gathered them. Others fell on the rock, and they did not put down root in the earth and they did not produce ears. And others fell on the thorns, they choked the seed and the worm ate them. And others fell on the earth which was good, and it gave fruit which was good. It bore sixty-fold and one hundred twenty-fold.

As Schrage's analysis shows, Thomas' text appears to be a mixture of all three Synoptic versions.[11] It shares with Matthew/Mark the introductory "Behold," the omission of the phrase "of heaven" with birds, the lack of the clause about the seed being trampled, the mention of roots, and the use of εἰς with thorns instead of the ἐν μέσῳ of Luke. With Mark/Luke Thomas uses καί. With Matthew alone he agrees in the use of the plural for seeds all the way through the parable, but he agrees with Luke's reading πέτραν over the πετρῶδες of the others. From this he correctly concludes that "a dependence on the Synoptic parables is not demonstrable."[12] Nevertheless, because of Thomas' secondary features and because of its parallels to the various Sahidic versions, he is convinced that Thomas is dependent on our Gospels.

---

[6] Plummer, Luke, pp. 217-219.

[7] Bultmann, History, p. 187.

[8] Jeremias, Gleichnisse, pp. 75-78. Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (3rd ed; New York: Charles Schribner's Sons, 1958), p.181.

[9] Bultmann, History, p. 200, n. 3.

[10] Jeremias, Gleichnisse, p. 109.

[11] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 42-48.

One of his important points from the Sahidic versions is the agreement of Thomas with Mark 4:6 sa in offering ⲙⲡⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ = μὴ βάλλειν ῥίζαν where our Greek texts of Mark offer only μὴ ἔχειν. Matthew's text in sy^{sc}Ta^{n}, however, offers βάλλειν. To him this indicates parallel influence at work in both Mark-sa and Thomas. Perhaps so, but if it is parallel influence, it is influence on the text of Thomas by the Sahidic version rather than in Thomas' sources themselves. Thus, it cannot prove the dependence of any of these readings on the Synoptic Gospels. His long list of other Sahidic instances of parallel influence only show that the text of this parable is very confused, almost certainly because of its great popularity.

The most important proof of Thomas' secondary character is the fact that Thomas' reading "root in the earth" has a parallel only in Matthew 13:6 sy^{c} and which must be a secondary addition based on the βάθος γῆς of the previous verse. All of Thomas' peculiar readings he sees as secondary.[13] This judgment is probably correct, but it does not prove Thomas' dependence on our Gospels either. It serves to do just the opposite; such extensive changes as these must have occurred in a long period of oral transmission.

---

[12] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 44.

Editorial analysis shows that the only readings which might be attributed to our Synoptic Evangelists are missing from Thomas. In the first place, he shows no knowledge of the collection of parables used by the Evangelists. The saying giving the reason for parables comes in Saying 41, and the secondary allegorical interpretation of the Sower does not occur at all in Thomas.[14] Secondly, the Lukan ἐν μέσῳ is also missing in Thomas. Its appearance there would have shown Thomas' use of Luke; its absence can only indicate the opposite. Thirdly, the agreement with Luke's reading of πέτραν is only agreement with what was most probably original, as we have shown above. Fourth, Thomas' lack of agreement with Matthew's δέ connectives indicates that he was not following the Matthean account and is no proof of dependence on Mark or Luke. Without these editorial traces the mixed appearance of Thomas' text and its secondary nature indicates only that Thomas' text comes from a late stage of the oral tradition, one influenced perhaps either by the written Gospels or by an early harmony of the Gospels.

---

[13] Schrage recounts the arguments made by Haenchen, ThR, XXVII(1961-1962), 167, and by Bartsch, NTS, VI(1960), 250-251, that Thomas' reading "on the road" must be a secondary correction of the Synoptic παρά. Luke's extra clause about the grain being trampled on does indeed show that the para was understood (at least by Luke or his source) as meaning "on." It is not clear whether or not the more correct translation of Thomas represents a correction. It is still possible that it represents an independent translation of the Aramaic.

[14] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 47, n. 15, argues that Thomas' interpretation presupposes an allegorical interpretation like that in the Gospels. Since allegorical interpretation was the order of the day, Thomas' use of it does not prove knowledge of the Synoptic allegory and certainly does not prove knowledge of the Synoptic collection of parables.

Matthew 13:3-9	Mark 4:3-9	Luke 8:3-9	Thomas 9
[3] καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς	[2] καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν		
πολλὰ ἐν παραβολαῖς λέγ-	παραβολαῖς πολλά, καὶ ἔλεγεν	εἶπεν	ⲡⲉϫⲉ
ων·	αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ.	διὰ παραβολῆς·	ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ
ἰδοὺ ἐξῆλθεν	[3] ἀκούετε· ἰδοὺ ἐξῆλθεν	[5] ἐξῆλθεν	ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉⲃ
ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν.	ὁ σπείρων σπεῖραι.	ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν	ⲟⲗ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲡⲉⲥⲓⲧⲉ
[4] καὶ ἐν τῷ	[4] καὶ ἐγένετο	σπόρον αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐν τῷ	ⲁϥⲙⲉϩ
σπείρειν αὐτὸν ἃ μὲν ἔ-	ἐν τῷ σπείρειν ὃ μὲν ἔ-	σπείρειν αὐτὸν ὃ μὲν ἔ-	ⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ̅ ⲁϥⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲁϩⲟⲉⲓⲛⲉ
πεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν.	πεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν,	πεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ	ⲙⲉⲛ ϩⲉ ⲉϫⲛ̅ ⲧⲉϩⲓⲏ
καὶ ἐλθόντα τὰ πε-	καὶ ἦλθεν τὰ πε-	κατεπατήθη, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ	ⲁⲩⲉⲓ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲛ̅ϩⲁⲗⲁⲧⲉ
τεινὰ κατέφαγεν αὐτά.	τεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.	τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέφαγον	ⲁⲩⲕⲁⲧⲯⲟⲩ
[5] ἄλλα δὲ ἔ-	[5] καὶ ἄλλο ἔ-	αὐτό. [6] καὶ ἕτερον κατέ-	ϩⲛ̅ⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲁⲩϩⲉ
πεσεν ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη	πεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες	πεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν,	ⲉϫⲛ̅ ⲧⲡⲉⲧⲣⲁ
ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολ-	ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολ-		
λήν, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξανέτει-	λήν, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξανέτει-		
λεν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος	λεν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος		
γῆς. [6] ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατεί-	γῆς· [6] καὶ ὅτε ἀνέτειλεν		
λαντος ἐκαυματίσθη, καὶ	ὁ ἥλιος ἐκαυματίσθη, καὶ	καὶ φυὲν ἐξ-	ⲁⲩⲱ
διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν ἐξ-	διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν ἐξ-	ηράνθη διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν	ⲙ̅ⲡⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ
ηράνθη.	ηράνθη.	ἰκμάδα.	ⲉⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̅ⲡⲟⲩⲧⲉⲩⲉ

Matthew 13:3-9	Mark 4:3-9	Luke 8:3-9	Thomas 9
[7] ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι καὶ ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτά.	[7] καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι καὶ συνέπνιξαν αὐτό, καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν.	[7] καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν, καὶ συμφυεῖσαι αἱ ἄκανθαι ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτό.	ϩⲙ̄ⲥ̄ ⲉϩⲣⲁ̈ⲓ ⲉⲧⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲁⲩϩⲉ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ϣⲟ̄ⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱϭⲧ ⲙⲡⲉϭⲣⲟϭ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲡϥⲛⲧ ⲟⲩⲟⲙⲟⲩ
[8] ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν καὶ ἐδίδου καρπόν, ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὃ δὲ ἐξήκοντα, ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα.	[8] καὶ ἄλλα ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοτα καὶ αὐξανόμενα καὶ ἔφερεν εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν.	[8] καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ φυὲν ἐποίησεν καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασίονα.	ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϩⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲟⲩⲉ ϩⲉ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥϯ ⲕⲁⲣⲡⲟⲥ ⲉϩⲣⲁ̈ⲓ ⲉⲧⲡⲉ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉ ⲉⲥⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ϣⲉ ϫⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲉⲥⲟⲧⲉ
[9] ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω.	[9] καὶ ἔλεγεν· ὃς ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.	ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει· ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω.	

CHAPTER XXIV

WHOEVER HAS, IT SHALL BE GIVEN TO HIM

Matthew 13:12, Mark 4:25, Luke 8:18b, Matthew 26:29
Luke 19:26 and Saying 41

The saying given by Mark 4:25par and by Matthew 25:29/Luke 19:26 (Q) was originally an independent saying as its appearance in two contexts shows.[1] In the first, it is used as part of the justification for Jesus' teaching in parables; in the second, it is used as the conclusion to the parable of the talents. According to Bultmann it was originally a secular mashal which has been placed on Jesus' lips in the tradition.[2]

Only a few differences occur in the five New Testament passages which offer this saying. In his parallels to Mark 4:25 Matthew offers an additional sentence "and he will have great abundance" to the sentence "it will be given him";[3] Luke, on the other hand, includes "what he thinks" in a later part of the saying so that it reads: "and whoever does not have, even what he thinks he has will be taken from him." The Q version differs in offering a dative attributive participle "to him who . . ." in the first strand and a genitive participle in the second. Matthew 25:26 again adds the abundance theme while Luke adds an introduction to the saying, "I say to you that . . ." Although none of these changes can be regarded as certainly editorial, the most probable ones are the abundance readings of Matthew and the "I say to you" of Luke: The former, because of its appearance both times in the work of the same Evangelist; the second, because it is a device used elsewhere by Luke.[4]

---

[1] Cf. M'Neile, Matthew, p. 190; Jeremias, Gleichnisse, p. 59, n. 10; Bultmann, History, p. 103; Dodd, Parables, p. 148; Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 202.

[2] Bultmann, History, p. 108.

[3] M'Neile, Matthew, p. 190, suggests that this may be due to the influence of a similar sentence "and it shall be added to you" in Mark

Thomas Saying 41 reads:

> Jesus said: Whoever has in his hand, it will be given to him, and he who does not have, the little which he has will be taken from him.

Schrage[5] correctly analyzes the relationship of Thomas' version of the saying to Synoptic parallels: It adds "in his hand"[6] and "little" and omits the two occurrences of *γάρ*. No evidence is found of either Matthew/Luke or Q. He correctly concludes that the agreements with Mark do not prove Thomas' use of Mark as a source. The absence of the agreements with Matthew/Luke, however, means that the only possible editorial traits in this passage are once again missing. It is the almost continual absence of all such possibilities that has led us to the conclusion that Thomas did not use the Synoptic Gospels as his

---

4:24. This observation seems well taken.

[4] Cf. Luke 4:24, 6:27, 11:8, 11:9, 12:4, 12:5, 12:8, et al.

[5] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, pp. 96-98.

[6] Kasser, *L'Évangile selon Thomas*, p. 71, offers the excellent suggestion that this addition comes from the Coptic rendering of *ἀπ' αὐτοῦ* by *ⲚⲦⲞⲞⲦ* which is literally "from his hand." Cf. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary*, p. 427.

sources. As support of that thesis it is again to be noted here that Thomas' use of this saying betrays no knowledge of any of the contexts in which it was placed in the New Testament. This, in spite of the fact that Thomas uses the Parable of the Sower (Saying 9) and the Simile of the Lamp (Saying 33b).

Matthew 13:12	Mark 4:25	Luke 8:18	Thomas 41
[12] ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ καὶ περισσευθήσεται· ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.	[25] Ὃς γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ· καὶ ὃς ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.	[18b] Ὃς ἂν γὰρ ἔχῃ, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ· καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ, καὶ ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉϥϭⲓϫ ⲥⲉⲛⲁϯ ⲛⲁϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲡⲕⲉϣⲏⲙ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲥⲉⲛⲁ ϥⲓⲧϥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧϥ
Matthew 25:9		Luke 19:26	
[29] τῷ γὰρ ἔχοντι παντὶ δοθήσεται καὶ περισσευθήσεται· τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.		[26] λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι παντὶ τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται.	

CHAPTER XXV

THE PARABLE OF THE TARES AMONG THE WHEAT

Matthew 13:24-30 and Saying 57

The Parable of the Tares is transmitted in the Synoptic Gospels only by Matthew. It is part of the collection of seven parables of Matthew 13 begun by the Parable of the Sower. Matthew introduces it with an editorial sentence: "He put before them another parable, saying." Outside of the introductory "The kingdom of heaven is like," the parable consists purely of narrative.[1] Jeremias feels that the details of the story are so vividly expressed that it must have come out of real life.[2] Jeremias also notes a certain abruptness when he observes that the reapers suddenly appear in verse 30 without any prior mention. Such a sudden shift in the narrative seems to indicate that it has already been compressed and/or altered to fit the allegorical meaning given later on in Chapter 13. In that meaning the parable is applied to the Church as a word of patience: At the last day God will separate the true believers in the Church from the false believers.

Thomas Saying 57 reads:

Jesus said: The kingdom of the Father is like a man who

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 177.

[2] Jeremias, Gleichnisse, pp. 222f. Manson's objections to some of these details, Sayings, pp. 192-194, are based on a misunderstanding of what darnel is. It resembles wheat so closely that it cannot be recognized until it heads out. Cf. Dodd, Parables, pp. 183-185.

> had seed which was good. His enemy came at night, he sowed a tare with the seed which was good. The man did not permit them to pull up the weed. He said to them: Lest perhaps you go to pull up the tare and you pull up the wheat with it. For on the day of harvest the weeds will appear, they will be pulled up and burned.

Schrage argues that Thomas must have been dependent on Matthew 13 for this parable because his version reveals that it is a condensation of the longer parable.[3] As evidence for this, he points to the fact that the suffix (plate 91, line 2) and the prepositional phrase ⲛⲟⲩ (plate 91, line 3) are without antecedents in Thomas' account. He notes also that the command of the man not to pull up the tare presupposes the question of the workers given by Matthew 13:27, and that the sowing of the tares appears too suddenly since the sowing of the good seed has dropped out.

Schrage is correct from this evidence in concluding that the shorter form of the parable offered by Thomas is not (by reason of its brevity) more original than the version given by Matthew. Only if one assumes that Matthew himself was the author of the parable, can one assume that these things are proof for the use of Matthew. Wilson puts it quite well when he writes:

> This condensation would appear to indicate a later stage of development than that represented by the canonical parable, but does not decide the question whether we have here a summary made from Matthew or independent access to the same tradition at a later point.[4]

It would seem that all the evidence available points to the greater probability of Wilson's latter suggestion. Thomas again has betrayed no knowledge of Matthew 13 in terms of the order of the parables. The later stage of the development in the parable itself shows that it must have been written down much later than the canonical parable. Finally, the agreements with the Coptic versions also show, as they do elsewhere, the influence of the Coptic versions on the Coptic translator of Thomas.

---

[3] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 124-126.

[4] Wilson, Studies, p. 91.

Matthew 13:24-30	Thomas 57
[24]Ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων·	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ
ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ	ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙⲡⲁⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲥⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲱⲛ ⲁⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ
σπείραντι καλὸν σπέρμα	ⲉⲩⲛ̅ⲧⲁϥ ⲙ̅ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̅ⲛⲟⲩϭⲣⲟϭ [ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩ]ϥ
ἐν ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ. [25]ἐν δὲ τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς ἀν-	ⲁⲡⲉϥϫⲁϫⲉ
θρώπους ἦλθεν αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρὸς καὶ ἐπέσπειρεν	ⲉⲓ ⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲩϣⲏ ⲁϥⲥⲓⲧⲉ
ζιζάνια ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σίτου καὶ ἀπῆλθεν.	ⲛⲟⲩⲍⲓⲍⲁⲛⲓⲟⲛ ⲙⲛ ⲡⲉϭⲣⲟ[ϭ ⲉ]ⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ
[26]ὅτε δὲ ἐβλάστησεν ὁ χόρτος καὶ καρπὸν ἐποί-	
ησεν, τότε ἐφάνη καὶ τὰ ζιζάνια. [27]προσελθόν-	
τες δὲ οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότου εἶπον αὐτῷ·	
κύριε, οὐχὶ καλὸν σπέρμα ἔσπειρας ἐν τῷ σῷ	
ἀγρῷ; πόθεν οὖν ἔχει ζιζάνια; [28]ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς·	
ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῦτο ἐποίησεν. οἱ δὲ δοῦλοι	
αὐτῷ λέγουσιν· θέλεις οὖν ἀπελθόντες συλλέξωμεν	
αὐτά; [29]ὁ δέ φησιν· οὔ, μήποτε συλλέγοντες τὰ ζι-	ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲕⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϩⲱⲗⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲍⲓⲍⲁⲛⲓⲟⲛ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ
ζάνια ἐκριζώσητε ἅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σῖτον. [30]ἄφετε συν-	ⲛⲁⲩ ϫⲉ ⲙⲏⲡⲱⲥ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲃⲱⲕ ϫⲉ ⲉⲛⲁϩⲱⲗⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲍⲓⲍⲁⲛⲓⲟⲛ
αυξάνεσθαι ἀμφότερα ἕως τοῦ θερισμοῦ· καὶ ἐν καιρῷ	ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ϩⲱⲗⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲥⲟⲩⲟ ⲛⲙ̅ⲙⲁϥ ϩⲙ̅ ⲫⲟⲟⲩ
τοῦ θερισμοῦ ἐρῶ τοῖς θερισταῖς· συλλέξατε πρῶτον	ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̅ⲡⲱϩⲥ̅ ⲛ̅ⲍⲓⲍⲁⲛⲓⲟⲛ ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
τὰ ζιζάνια καὶ δήσατε αὐτὰ εἰς δέσμας πρὸς τὸ κατακαῦσαι	ⲥⲉϩⲟⲗⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲥⲉⲣⲟⲕϩⲟⲩ
αὐτά, τὸν δὲ σῖτον συναγάγετε εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην μου.	

CHAPTER XXVI

THE PARABLES OF THE MUSTARD SEED AND LEAVEN

Matthew 13:31-33, Mark 4:30-32, Luke 13:18-21

and Sayings 20 and 96

All three Synoptic Gospels offer somewhat different versions of the Parable of the Mustard Seed while Matthew and Luke alone offer the Parable of the Leaven. The similarities shared by Matthew and Luke indicate that both parables were already together in Q,[1] and that Matthew's version of the Mustard Seed represents a combining of Mark and Q. The connecting link offered by Luke "And he said again" is more original than Matthew's "He spoke another parable to them," but, as Bultmann points out, a simple ἤ would be the original form if the two parables were originally twin parables.[2]

The Marcan version of the Parable of the Mustard Seed opens with a double question and begins the parable itself with ὡς. Two ὅταν clauses rather awkwardly describe the sowing of the seed and its size before the point is made that it grows into the greatest of shrubs and has large branches.

---

[1] They share ὁμοία ἐστιν, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος, δένδρον and ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις against Mark in the Mustard Seed while their versions of the Leaven are almost identical.

[2] Bultmann, History, p. 172, does not comment on the fact that MS D gives this reading for Luke 13:20. According to his reasoning it ought to mean that D here offers the earliest form of the combining parables.

Luke's version also begins with a double question both begun by τίνι. Because of the repetition of this pattern in the Parable of the Leaven it is probably original.[3] The question is answered with "it is like . . .," the size of the seed is omitted, the seed is "cast into the garden" rather than being sown in the ground (Mark) or in the field (Matthew). The parable concludes with the reference to the seed becoming a tree, the nesting place for the birds of heaven, evidently an Old Testament allusion (Ez. 17:23, Ps. 103-17, Daniel 4:18).

Matthew's account begins without the question in a narrative form similar to Luke's version: "The kingdom . . . is like . . . ." It relates the sowing of the seed in the same way as Luke (Q), seems to pick up the size of the seed from Mark though it uses better Greek, combines Mark's "greatest of bushes" with Q's "tree" and concludes similarly to the Lukan version.

Editorial traits are quite difficult to distinguish in any of the accounts. The οὖν which accompanies "he said" in Luke 13:18 is almost certainly Lukan.[4] Matthew's omission of the questions may be his work or he may have found it that way in his source. Whether Luke omitted the size of the seed from Q, or whether Matthew added it from Mark is also in doubt though the latter seems more likely. The combination of "bush" and "tree" was certainly made by Matthew.

In the Parable of the Leaven Matthew again does not witness to the opening question while his connecting link is definitely his own work.

---

[3] Bultmann, *History*, p. 172; Klostermann, *Matthäusevangelium*, p. 121; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 269. Cf. Luke 7:31-35/Matthew 11:16-19; Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 189-191.

[4] Harnack, *Sayings*, p. 28; Plummer, *Luke*, p. 344.

Thomas Saying 20 reads:

> The disciples said to Jesus: Tell us, what is the Kingdom of Heaven like? He said to them: It is like a mustard seed smaller than all the seeds, but when it falls on the ground which is tilled, it produces a large branch and becomes a shelter for the birds of heaven.

Thomas Saying 96 reads:

> Jesus said: The Kingdom of the Father is like a woman, she took a little leaven and hid it in dough, she made large loaves. He who has ears let him hear.

Schrage's analysis of the relationship between Saying 20 and the Synoptic versions of the parable shows that Thomas' text here also appears to be a mixture of all three of those versions.[5] Although his analyses are not entirely accurate, this impression remains.[6] Thomas does agree with Mark in the reading of branches, and with Matthew/Mark in relating the size of the seed. With Matthew Thomas reads "Kingdom of Heaven." His readings agree with Matthew and Luke (Q) in beginning the parable itself with ὁμοία ἐστιν and with Luke in the ⲉⲛⲓⲙ=τίνι in the questions. The conclusion about the shelter is a reading peculiar to Thomas. Thus, Thomas appears to be a conflating of the Mark and Q versions of the story but in a way different from Matthew's and with its individual ending.

Because of Thomas' agreement with Matthew in "Kingdom of Heaven," Schrage feels that dependence on Matthew's version at least is proved. We have already shown earlier (pp. 31-32) that the agreement with

---

[5] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 61-66.

[6] The conclusions to the parable in the Synoptics and that in Thomas, though having the same general implications, are not shared in the sense of wording as they speak of nesting, Thomas of a shelter. Whether Thomas' "tilled earth" is closer to Mark's earth, Matthew's field (fields are cultivated) or Luke's garden (very well cared-for) is also hard to say.

"Kingdom of Heaven" cannot prove dependence. The fact that Thomas lacks any relationship to Matthew's introductory sentence and to his combination of Q's "tree" with Mark's "bush" also shows that he was not dependent on Matthew.[7]

Schrage admits that the other similarities do not prove dependence:

> All of this is, however, just as much without that conclusiveness for the dependence of Thomas as this, that Matthew/Luke as well as Thomas introduce the comparison with the Mustard Seed by ὁμοία ἐστιν as against Mark's ὡς.[8]

Thus, there is no real proof of dependence at all. The absence of the editorial οὖν of Luke also supports this conclusion, as Thomas might easily have retained it if he were using Luke since Saying 20 is one of the few sayings not introduced by the formula "Jesus said."

In Saying 20 we are faced, therefore, with the same kind of a problem met in most of the other sayings: Thomas' text could be a mixture of Matthew, Mark and Luke but it lacks completely any traces of their editorial work. This lack of editorial traits combined with the evidences that Thomas' saying has undergone further secondary development once again can lead best to the conclusion that Thomas' source for this saying was not our Synoptic Gospels. The signs of further secondary development are similar to those met elsewhere: One, the rhetorical question has been transferred from Jesus to his disciples; two, the parable has been shortened and the elements rearranged;[9] three, the large branches witnessed to by Mark have become under gnostic influence "a large branch."

---

[7] The ὅταν δὲ of Thomas is not dependent on Matthew as it occurs with the word on sowing while Matthew's occurs with the word on growth. ὅταν by itself occurs already in Mark.

[8] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 62.

[9] The position of the words describing the smallness of the seed are somewhat awkwardly placed in both Mark and Matthew. Thomas' placement

Schrage tries to show that the word σκέπη in Thomas could go back to Mark's σκιά since two bohairic MSS translate the Marcan phrase with the same word used for σκέπη.[10] This reasoning cannot be maintained. In the first place, Thomas' Coptic does not show much relationship to the bohairic at all.[11] Secondly, in Saying 20 we are not dealing with a Coptic word which might translate two different Greek words but with the Greek word itself. It seems extremely unlikely that the Coptic translator translated the Greek word σκιά with another Greek word σκέπη. Such a substitution might have occurred in the oral development of the saying, but it is hardly the result of the translation process.

With regard to Saying 96 Schrage makes no claims for proof of its dependence on Matthew/Luke.[12] He does say that it is a parable derived from Q and reworked by Thomas. Since the exact nature of Q is not recoverable, this latter judgment is actually impossible to make. What can be said is that we have the parable of the leaven in a form very similar to that provided us also by Matthew/Luke (Q). The question of sources on this evidence alone must remain open. Only if one is willing to contend that Matthew's omission of the question at the beginning of

---

of them as an appositive to mustard-seed must be viewed as an improvement, rather than the other way around.

[10] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 64.

[11] The relationships Schrage finds between Thomas and the Sahidic New Testament are interesting for textual critical problems, but, since they show nothing about the original Greek text of Thomas, they cannot help decide the question of sources.

[12] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 183-185.

the parable is his own work, then a stronger case for dependency might be claimed. However, Schrage correctly observes that Thomas himself was capable of this kind of an alteration.[13] His comparisons with the other Sahidic translations revealed nothing of great importance: sy^c and some old Latin MSS do share with Thomas the omission of the three measures of meal.

Thomas' version offers only three peculiarities of its own: One, the reversal of the order of leaven and woman--"The Kingdom of the Father is like a woman"; two, the adjective little has been added to leaven and the loaves have become large ones; three, the concluding saying "He who has ears let him hear" has been added to the parable.

Grant-Freedman suggest that the first of these is due to the gnostic tendency to attribute salvation to the work of the gnostic himself rather than to God.[14] It would seem that this is so.[15] The change to "Kingdom of the Father" is typical for Thomas. It is also almost certain that the contrast between small and large was due to gnostic tendencies, the contrast between the divine spark in the gnostic and the perfection at which he aims. The third change is evidence for the freedom with which a saying such as this was used. The fact that it doesn't appear in the Synoptic Gospels at least suggests the possibility that Thomas represents another translation.

The most convincing argument for an independent tradition is that based on the separation in Thomas of this parable from that of the

---

[13] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 184.

[14] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, pp. 186-187.

[15] Cf. Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 184. For a different opinion one can see Wilson, Studies, p. 96.

Mustard Seed. The two parables were undoubtedly together in Q; they are widely separated in Thomas. If Thomas was using Matthew 13 or Luke 13, his use of these parables in this way would be very difficult to understand.

Note on "He who has ears let him hear"

This saying has commonly been recognized as one of those widespread, much used sayings which were freely attached to other sayings. It appears in two forms in the Synoptic Gospels:[16] Matthew uses only "He who has ears let him hear"; Mark and Luke only the form "He who has ears to hear, let him hear." Thomas witnesses to both of these forms: Sayings 24, 63, 65 and 96 are like the Matthean form; Sayings 8 and 21 are like that used by Mark and Luke.

Thomas' use of the saying is, however, completely different from that of our canonical Gospels. Except for Saying 24 it is used exclusively with parables, but not with any of the same parables with which it appears in our Gospels.

Gärtner somehow concludes from this evidence that Thomas is either "a polemic against the New Testament, or an assertion that the persons backing the Gospel of Thomas considered themselves to have their own independent traditions."[17] This position is completely untenable. Thomas' claim from his introductory saying and on is to have the true interpretation of the words of Jesus, not a better text than that of the Church. It is highly improbable that he would have directed a polemic against the texts used by the Church for this reason. The concern over the type of tradition involved is purely a modern one. Schrage is more correct in his conclusion that Thomas' use of such a saying in whatever form it occurs cannot be used as proof of his dependence on our Gospels.[18] Perhaps one can go still one step further and say that Thomas' free use of this phrase at least raises the possibility that he was using as his sources a tradition or set of traditions independent of our canonical Gospels.

---

[16] Matthew 11:15, 13:9, 13:43; Mark 4:9, 4:23, 7:16; Luke 8:8, 14:35.

[17] Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, p. 210.

---

[18] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 42.

Matthew 13:31-32	Mark 4:30-32	Luke 10:18-19	Thomas 20
31			ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲛ̄ⲓ̄ⲥ̄ ϫⲉ
[31]Ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθη-			
κεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· ὁμοία	[30]καὶ ἔλεγεν· πῶς	ἔλεγεν οὖν· τίνι	ϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ϫⲉ
ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρα-	ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν	ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ	ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲉⲥⲧⲛ̄
νῶν	τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν	θεοῦ, καὶ τίνι ὁμοιώ-	ⲧⲱⲛ ⲉⲛⲓⲙ
	παραβολῇ θῶμεν; ὡς	σω αὐτήν; ὁμοία ἐστὶν	ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲩ ϫⲉ ⲉⲥⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲛ
κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λα-	κόκκῳ σινάπεως ὃς ὅταν	κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λα-	ⲁⲩⲃⲗ̄ⲃⲓⲗⲉ ⲛ̄ϣⲗ̄ⲧⲁⲙ
βὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρεν	σπαρῇ	βὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔβαλεν	
ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ, ὃ μικρό-	ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μικρότερον ὂν	εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ,	
τερον μὲν ἐστὶν πάντων	πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν		ⲥⲟⲃⲕ̄ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲛ̄ϭⲣⲟϭ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ
τῶν σπερμάτων, ὅταν δὲ	ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ,	καὶ	ϩⲟⲧⲁⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲥϣⲁⲛϩⲉ ⲉϫⲙ̄
αὐξηθῇ μεῖζον	ἀναβαίνει καὶ γίνεται μεῖζον	ηὔξανεν	ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲣ̄ ϩⲱⲃ ⲉⲣⲟϥ
τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶν καὶ	πάντων τῶν λαχάνων, καὶ	καὶ	
γίνεται δένδρον,	ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους,	ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον	ϣⲁϥⲧⲉⲩⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲟϭ
ὥστε ἐλθεῖν τὰ πετεῖνα	ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν		ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣ
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατασκη-	σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετείνα τοῦ	καὶ τὰ πετείνα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	ⲛ̄ϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲡⲏ
νοῦν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.	οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν	κατασκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς κλά-	ⲛ̄ϩⲁⲗⲁⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲉ
		δοις αὐτοῦ.	

Matthew 13:33	Luke 13:20	Thomas 96
[33] Ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς· ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ζύμῃ, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία, ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη ὅλον.	[20] καὶ πάλιν εἶπεν· τίνι ὁμοιώσω τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; [21] ὁμοία ἐστὶν ζύμῃ, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἔκρυψεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία, ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη ὅλον.	[πεϫε] ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲥⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲱ[ⲛ ⲉⲟⲩ]ⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲁⲥϫⲓ ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲛ̅ⲥⲁⲉⲓⲣ[ⲉ ⲁⲥϩⲟ]ⲡϥ ϩⲛ̅ ⲟⲩϣⲱⲧ ⲁⲥⲁⲁϥ ⲛ̅ϩⲛ̅ⲛⲟ[ϭ] ⲛ̅ⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲩⲙ̅ ⲙⲁⲁϫⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟϥ ⲙⲁ[ⲣⲉϥ]ⲥⲱⲧⲙ

CHAPTER XXVII

THE PARABLES OF THE HIDDEN TREASURE AND THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Matthew 13:44-46 and Sayings 109 and 76a

The Parables of the Hidden Treasure (Matthew 13:44) and of the Pearl of Great Price (Matthew 13:45-46) constitute a double parable.[1] Both begin with the introductory phrase ὁμοία ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία which is a secondary formula.[2] The two are connected in Matthew simply by πάλιν which is also a secondary element and which shows that the parables did not originally belong together.[3]

Matthew uses these two parables as illustrations of how true disciples will react at finding the kingdom of heaven. That reaction is one of such an overwhelming joy that they are ready to part with all their goods to possess it.[4] It is this joy which distinguishes them from those who are in the Church but not in the Kingdom (Matthew 13:36-43); it exemplifies the conduct of the righteous "who will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their father." (Matthew 13:43)[5]

---

[1] Bultmann, History, pp. 173, 194ff; Jeremias, Gleichnisse, pp. 89-92.

[2] Bultmann, History, p. 180.

[3] The same link is used in Matthew 13:24, 31, 33, 47. Cf. Bultmann, History, pp. 194f; Jeremias, Gleichnisse, pp. 197-198.

[4] Cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp. 225ff; M'Neile, Matthew, pp. 203ff; Manson, Sayings, pp. 196f.

[5] Bornkamm-Barth-Held, Überlieferung, p. 17, n. 4.

Bultmann quotes one Rabbinic parallel to the Parable of the Treasure: "In the field sold by the proprietor the purchaser finds treasures of silver and gold."[6]

Thomas Saying 109 reads:

> Jesus said: The kingdom is like a man who had in his field a treasure which was hidden and unknown to him. And when he died, he left it to his son. The son did know (of it). He accepted that field; he sold it. And he who bought it came. When he was plowing, he found the treasure. He began to give the money to whomever he wished.

The arguments for the dependence of Thomas upon Matthew for the Parable of the Hidden Treasure are based on this reasoning: Since Thomas' form of the parable could have developed from Matthew's, it must have done so. Cervaux understands it as the result of the combining of elements from the Matthean parable of hidden treasure, a rabbinic parallel, and an Aesop's Fable.[7] Kasser attributes the changes to Thomas' redactor.[8] Gärtner says that the version changes the parable to fit a gnostic version of "works righteousness" so that Thomas must be an alteration of Matthew.[9] Schrage concludes his analysis with these words: "The parable in no way gives the impression of originality as over against Matthew."[10] As we have argued in earlier sections, even if we could be certain that Thomas' version represents an alteration of the parable we know in Matthew 13:44, that knowledge would tell us nothing about whether Thomas used Matthew as a literary source.

---

[6] Bultmann, History, p. 202.

[7] Cervaux, Mus, LXX(1957), 315.

[8] Kasser, L'Évangile selon Thomas, p. 117.

[9] Gartner, Theology of . . . Thomas, pp. 237-238.

[10] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 197.

In the light of the many close parallels to Thomas 109 from other literature, the judgment of Grant-Freedman seems a much more likely conclusion than the one offered above: "Presumably Thomas has taken a current popular tale and assigned it to Jesus."[11] The fact that the point of Thomas' parable, namely that a majority of men do not recognize the treasure within themselves, is completely different from that of the Matthean parable further strengthens the argument against Matthew as Thomas' source.[12] The only possible evidence of Matthean redaction, namely that of the collection of parables itself, is once again absent from Thomas. Thus, there is no evidence to support the case for Thomas' use of Matthew 13:44 for Saying 109.

Thomas Saying 76a reads:

> Jesus said: The kingdom of the Father is like a man, a merchant who had merchandise. Then he found a pearl. That merchant was wise. He sold the merchandise; he bought for himself the one pearl.

The argument for a dependency upon Matthew by Thomas is once again that Thomas' form of the parable is a gnostic revision of the Matthean parable.[13] Schrage goes so far as to suggest that without knowledge of the Matthean version the parable is almost unintelligible.[14] Such a conclusion is unwarranted, for, even if we could presume such a knowledge of Thomas, we cannot do so for all of his gnostic readers. As Haenchen clearly points out, the pearl was identified with the essential divine nature within the gnostic.[15] The only meaningful course for the gnostic would be to give up everything else for that pearl. He would hardly have needed Matthew's version to tell him it was an especially valuable pearl. Nonetheless, there seems little doubt that Thomas' parable is a gnostic version of the Parable of the Pearl.[16] This fact tells us nothing, however, about Thomas' source for the parable, unless one is willing to argue that the parable is a Matthean construction. Schrage admits that there is no editorial evidence that Matthew was the source.[17]

---

[11] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 194.

[12] Haenchen, Botschaft, p. 47; Jeremias, Gleichnisse, p. 28, argues that in Thomas we have a parable clearly formed under the influence of a rabbinic account while Matthew's has another point entirely. Therefore, Thomas has nothing in common with the Matthean story which is certainly an original one.

[13] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 155-159; Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 177; Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, pp. 37ff; Kasser, L'Evangile selon Thomas, pp. 98f.

If there is no evidence for dependency in Thomas' version of the parable, there are at least some indications that the contrary is true. First of all, Matthew's connecting link *πάλιν* is missing in Thomas. Secondly, its position in Thomas shows no relationship to the order of Matthew 13. Thirdly, Thomas' *merchant* as opposed to Matthew's *merchant seeking valuable pearls* may well be the more original as Jeremias says, as the Synoptic reading does serve to strengthen the point of the Synoptic parable.[18] Fourthly, again as Jeremias points out, Thomas' reading of one pearl may well represent a more correct translation of the Aramaic חד than Matthew's ἕνα. Because of these indications we cannot conclude that Thomas used Matthew as his source for Saying 76a.

---

[14] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, p. 156.

[15] Haenchen, *Botschaft*, pp. 47-48.

[16] The use of the Kingdom of the Father and the calling of the merchant wise are evidences of the gnostic concerns.

[17] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, p. 156.

[18] Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, p. 198.

Matthew 13:44	Thomas 109
[44] Ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν θησαυρῷ κεκρυμμένῳ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, ὃν εὑρὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔκρυψεν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ ὑπάγει καὶ πωλεῖ ὅσα ἔχει καὶ ἀγοράζει τὸν ἀγρὸν ἐκεῖνον.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲉⲥⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲛ ⲉⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ [ⲙⲙ]ⲁⲩ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉϥⲥⲱϣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲉϩⲟ ⲉϥϩ[ⲏⲡ ⲉϥ]ⲟ ⲛⲧⲁⲥⲟⲩⲛ' ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄[ⲛⲛⲥⲁ ⲧ]ⲣⲉϥ ⲙⲟⲩ ⲁϥⲕⲁⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥ[ϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲛⲉⲡ]ⲏⲣⲉ ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲁϥϥⲓ ⲧⲥⲱϣⲉ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲁϥⲧⲁⲁ[ϥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲧⲟⲟⲩⲥ ⲁϥⲉⲓ ⲉϥⲥⲕⲁⲓ [ⲁϥϩⲉ] ⲁⲡⲉϩⲟ ⲁϥⲁⲣⲭⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ϯ ϩⲟⲙⲧ' ⲉⲧⲙⲏⲥⲉ ⲛ[ⲛⲉⲧ]ϥ̄ⲟⲩⲁϣⲟⲩ
[45] Πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐμπόρῳ ζητοῦντι καλοὺς μαργαρίτας. [46] εὑρὼν δὲ ἕνα πολύτιμον μαργαρίτην ἀπελθὼν πέπρακεν πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν καὶ ἠγόρασεν αὐτόν.	Thomas 76a ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲥⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲛ ⲁⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲫⲟⲣⲧⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲁϥϩⲉ ⲁⲩⲙⲁⲣⲅⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲡⲉϣⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲟⲩⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲁϥϯ ⲡⲉⲫⲟⲣⲧⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁϥⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲙⲁⲣⲅⲁⲣⲓⲧⲏⲥ ⲟⲩⲱⲧ

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE PARABLE OF THE NET

Matthew 13:47-50 and Saying 8

The Parable of the Fishnet (Matthew 13:47-50) is an eschatological parable dealing with the last judgment.[1] As fishermen sort their catch, so also the angels will sort out mankind at the last day. Habakkuk 1:14-17 uses a similar metaphor for a description of the last judgment.[2]

The only visible editorial trait, outside of the positioning of the parable within Matthew 13, is the πάλιν which connects it to the parables of the Treasure and the Pearl. The close proximity of this parable to the Parable of the Tares suggests that Matthew understood it as a description of the mixed character of the Church in the interim before the last days.[3]

Thomas Saying 8 reads:

> And he said: The Man is like a wise fisherman who cast his net into the sea. He drew it up from the sea full of small fish. Among them he found a large fish which was good. That

---

[1] Manson, Sayings, p. 197, unconvincingly argues that the parable was originally about the missionary task of the disciples since the angels appear only in the application of the parable. Why one should expect the application to use the same persons as the parable itself is unclear. The οὕτως clearly indicates that an application, not an allegorical interpretation, is being made.

[2] Bultmann, History, p. 173; Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp. 228-229; Jeremias, Gleichnisse, p. 222.

[3] Bornkamm-Barth-Held, Überlieferung, pp. 17, 55, 255.

> wise fisherman threw all the little fish back into the sea. He chose the large fish without hesitation. He who has ears to hear, let him hear.

Those who claim Thomas' dependence on our Synoptic Gospels argue that Thomas' Saying 8 shows how far his gnostic tendencies led him in his alteration of Synoptic material. Their proof of this alteration consists in a description of the very great differences between Thomas 8 and Matthew 13:47-50. It is necessary to resort to this internal evidence "because the redactional traces in the parable belonging to Matthew's special material can scarcely be determined."[4]

The case for dependency here is thus very weak. Neither Matthew's πάλιν nor the arrangement of parables from Matthew 13 can be demonstrated. On the contrary, Thomas 8 presents us with a parable so different from Matthew 13:47-50 that even a casual reader of Thomas, though he might be reminded of the Matthean parable, ought to suspect that Thomas 8 is an entirely different parable. The only things the two have in common, after all, is the "like" introduction and the idea of a net. Jeremias' accute observation that the net in Thomas 8 and that in Matthew 13 are of two different types is clear evidence that Thomas 8 is not merely a redaction of Matthew 13:47f.[5] Thomas 8 also has a completely different point than the Matthean parable, namely that of the joy of the fisherman at finding the large fish. Kasser's listing of the common elements out of which Thomas 8 is constructed, and Schrage's evidence from Clement, Strom VI, 95,3 strengthen the conviction that Thomas 8 represents another parable entirely.

---

[4] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 37. Cf. Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, pp. 233-34; Wilson, Studies, p. 40; Kasser, L'Évangile selon Thomas, p. 40; Haenchen, Botschaft, p. 48.

[5] Jeremias, Gleichnisse, pp. 199-200.

Note on the Parables of Matthew 13

Thomas' arrangement of the parables found also in Matthew betrays no knowledge of Matthew's collection of those parables. Saying 8 (Net) is parallel to Matthew 13:47-50; Saying 9 (The Sower) to Matthew 13:4-9; Saying 20 (Mustard Seed) to 13:31-32; Saying 41 (He Who Has . . .) to 13:12; Saying 57 (Tares) to 13:24; Saying 76a (Pearl of Great Price) to 13:45-46; Saying 96 (Leaven) to 13:33; Saying 109 (Hidden Treasure) to 13:44.

Matthew 13:47-50	Thomas 8
[47]Πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν σαγήνῃ βληθείσῃ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγούσῃ·	ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲉⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲱⲛ ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲱϩⲉ ⲣ̅ⲣⲙ̅ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧ ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁϩⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉϥⲁⲃⲱ ⲉⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ ⲁϥⲥⲱⲕ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲥ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ϩⲛ̅ ⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ ⲉⲥⲙⲉϩ ⲛ̅ⲧⲃ̅ⲧ ⲛ̅ⲕⲟⲩⲉⲓ
[48]ἣν ὅτε ἐπληρώθη ἀναβιβάσαντες ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν καὶ καθίσαντες συνέλεξαν τὰ καλὰ εἰς ἄγγη, τὰ δὲ σαπρὰ ἔξω ἔβαλον.	ⲛ̅ϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲁϥϩⲉ ⲁⲩⲛⲟϭ ⲛ̅ⲧⲃ̅ⲧ ⲉⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ ⲛ̅ϭⲓ ⲡⲟⲩⲱϩⲉ ⲣ̅ⲣⲙ̅ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧ ⲁϥⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲛ̅ ⲛ̅ⲕⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛ̅ⲧⲃⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉ[ⲡⲉ]ⲥⲏⲧ ⲉⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ ⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲡ ⲙ̅ⲡϭⲣⲟϭ ⲛ̅ⲧⲃ̅ⲧ ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ ϩⲓⲥⲉ
[49]οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος· ἐξελεύσονται οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ ἀφοριοῦσιν τοὺς πονηροὺς ἐκ μέσου τῶν δικαίων, [50]καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.	
	ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲟⲩⲛ̅ ⲙⲁⲁϫⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟϥ ⲉⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅ ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅

CHAPTER XXIX

DEFILEMENT - TRADITIONAL AND REAL

Matthew 15:1-20, Mark 7:1-23
and Sayings 14c, 40 and 34

Mark 7:1-23 represents the earlier of the two Synoptic pericopes, both of which contain most of the same material. The Marcan pericope is composed of four major sections: vv. 1-8; 9-13; 14-19; 20-23. Matthew abbreviated and rearranged these parts but kept the basic outline: vv. 1-2 abbreviate Mark 7:1-6; vv. 3-6 insert the material of Mark 7:9-13; vv. 8-9 provide the Isaiah quotation with which Mark's first section (vv. 6-8) is concluded: vv. 10-20 give the material of Mark 7:14-23 plus two new sayings given in vv. 13 and 14. The editorial verses are thus: Mark 7:1; Matthew 15:1; Mark 7:9; Mark 7:14; Matthew 15:10; Mark 7:20.[1]

Only Matthew 15:11/Mark 7:15, Matthew 15:13 and Matthew 15:14 will be of concern for this study. Matthew 15:11 differs considerably from Mark 7:15: Matthew uses an attributive participial construction for both members of the saying ("that which enters . . .," and "that which comes out of . . .") while Mark uses a relative clause ("which can defile . . .") in the first member and an attributive participle ("those things which come out of . . .") in the second; Matthew's account adds "into the mouth" and "from the mouth" to the saying; Matthew uses τόν ἄνθρωπον as the object of κοινόω both times while Mark uses αὐτόν the first time. Whether these differences in reading are to be attributed to Matthew's editorial work is a matter of opinion. If they are regarded as such, they must have been made for stylistic reasons. On the other hand, the additional phrases relating to the mouth in Matthew make it necessary to assume more than stylistic changes. As Lohmeyer points out, these references do not make the verse refer more clearly to the clean/unclean issue than does the Marcan reading.[2] These phrases suggest the possibility, therefore, that Matthew here replaced Mark 7:15 with another version of the saying from his special material.

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 17; Schmidt, Der Rahmen, pp. 196-198.

Thomas Saying 14c says:

> For that which goes into your mouth will not defile you, but that which comes out of your mouth, this is that which will defile you.

Thomas' saying thus once again appears at first glance to be a mixture of the Matthean and Marcan versions of the saying. It shares with Matthew the references to mouth and evidently witnesses to a Greek attributive participle in the first half of the saying. This agreement convinces Schrage that Thomas is dependent on Matthew for this saying.[3] In the second member Thomas "agrees" with Matthew's singular number but with Mark's participial form τὰ κοινοῦντα rather than Matthew's κοινοῖ.[4] Since none of these agreements are with readings that are clearly editorial, they in no way establish Thomas' dependence on Matthew.

---

[2] Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp. 246-248, suggests other possibilities such as breath and sound which also enter and leave by way of mouth.

[3] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 55.

[4] Schrage does not discuss this point.

Two points support the view that Thomas' version is an independent version of the saying. One, Thomas' saying again appears to be a curiously mixed text, yet no reason for that mixing can be offered. Two, Schrage has overlooked the fact that Saying 14c says "will not defile you" while both Synoptic accounts say "will not defile a man." That third person object is needed in the Synoptic accounts because these pericopes are placed in a clearly secondary situation, a defence of Jesus' disciples rather than of Jesus Himself.[5] It seems more likely, therefore, that the second person , a defence of Jesus himself, is the original.

Matthew 15:13 is a verse peculiar to the Matthean and appears to be, as said above, an insertion into the pericope. There are many Jewish and Christian parallels for this saying.[7] Thus, neither the figure itself nor the severe judgment can in any sense be attributed to Matthew; only the positioning of the verse within the pericope is likely to be his work. It follows that the introductory "he answered and said" is also due to Matthew.

Thomas Saying 40 reads:

> Jesus said: A Vine has been planted apart from the Father, and, since it is not strong, it will be pulled up by its roots and it will perish.

---

[5] Bultmann, History, p. 48.

[6] Cf. a similar conclusion concerning the beatitudes.

[7] Isaiah 60:21; Proverbs 12:3 and 15; Jeremiah 2:21; Psalm 1:3; Jeremiah 24:6; Ezekiel 19:10-14; Daniel 4:14 and 23; Psalms of Solomon 12:2ff; Matthew 3:10, 7:19; John 15:1-2; IgnTrallians xi; IgnPhilippians iii.

Although there is not enough evidence for proof of Thomas' dependence on Matthew at this point, Schrage would still like to understand a loose connection between the two.[8] Quispel, on the other hand, sees in Saying 40 distinct evidences of an independent tradition.[9] Since the only editorial evidence from Matthew, that of his placing it within a pericope, is missing, we must find at the very least, that Thomas shows no evidence at all of dependence.

The third and last saying from this pericope which appears in Thomas is that about the blind leading the blind, Matthew 15:14/Luke 6:39. The Lukan question form of the saying is probably no grounds for holding that the change was Matthew's work. However, Matthew's introductory sentences, "Avoid them, they are blind leaders of the blind," pointed references to the Pharisees and scribes in the Matthean context, are most probably due to Matthew.

Thomas Saying 34 reads:

> Jesus said: If a blind man leads a blind man, both always fall down into a pit.

Schrage feels certain that Thomas' conditional form of the saying proves a dependence on Matthew. Since the form of the saying in Matthew cannot be definitely attributed to Matthew, such a conclusion cannot be held. As Haenchen points out, even though for Thomas the blind man represented the non-gnostic, the gnostic Tendenz had no influence on the form of the saying.[11] Even more significant is the fact that once again

---

[8] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 95.

[9] Quispel, VC, XII(1958), 188f.

[10] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 85.

[11] Haenchen, ThR, XXVII(1961-1962), 328.

Matthew's connecting-link words, even those about the blind leaders of the blind, are completely missing in Thomas.

Matthew 15:11	Mark 7:15	Thomas 14c
[11] οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον· ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος, τοῦτο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.	[15] οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν ὃ δύναται κοινῶσαι αὐτόν. ἀλλά τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενα ἐστιν τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον.	ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲃⲱⲕ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲧⲁ ⲡⲣⲟ ϥⲛⲁϫⲱϩⲙ̄ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲡⲉ ⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲏⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲡⲉ ⲧⲛ̄ⲁϫⲁϩⲙ̄ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄
Matthew 15:13		**Thomas 40**
[13] ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· πᾶσα φυτεία ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος ἐκριζωθήσεται		ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲟⲩⲃⲉ ⲛⲉⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ ⲁⲩⲧⲟϭⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲓ ⲱⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲥⲧⲁϫⲣⲏⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲡⲟⲣⲕ̄ⲥ̄ ϩⲁ ⲧⲉⲥⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲧⲁⲕⲟ
Matthew 15:14		**Thomas 34**
[14] ἄφετε αὐτούς· τυφλοί εἰσιν ὁδηγοὶ τυφλῶν· τυφλὸς δὲ τυφλὸν ἐὰν ὁδηγῇ, ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται.		ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲃ̄ⲗ̄ⲗⲉ ⲉϥϣⲁⲛⲥⲱⲕ ϩⲏⲧϥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩ ⲃⲗ̄ⲗⲉ ϣⲁⲩϩⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ ⲉⲩϩⲓⲉⲓⲧ

CHAPTER XXX

PETER'S CONFESSION

Matthew 16:13-20, Mark 8:27-30, Luke 9:18-21

and Saying 13a

Thomas Saying 13a reads:

> Jesus said to his disciples: Make a comparison to Me and tell Me whom I am like. Simon Peter said to him: Thou art like a righteous angel. Matthew said to him: Thou art like a wise man of understanding. Thomas said to him: Master, my mouth will not at all be capable of saying whom thou art like. Jesus said: I am not thy Master, because Thou has drunk, thou hast become drunk from the bubbling spring which I have measured out.[1]

Some would see this saying as expanded version of Mark 8:27-30.[2] Since the Caesarea Philippi pericope is a Marcan composition, Thomas' use of it does at first indicate a dependence of Mark at this point. Although the composition of the pericope must be assigned to Mark, however, that does not mean that he created the incident itself. The localization of it at Caesarea and the concluding verses (30-33) which predict the passion are Marcan.[3] Since none of these occur in Thomas, there is no editorial evidence for Thomas' dependence here. Schrage does not discuss the passage.

---

[1] According to the translation of the Harper edition.

[2] Kasser, L'Évangile selon Thomas, p. 47; Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, p. 125; Haenchen, ThR, XXVII(1961-1962), 315.

[3] Bultmann, History, pp. 257-259, Cf. Schmidt, Der Rahmen, pp. 215-217, and Taylor, Mark, p. 374.

CHAPTER XXXI

THE DISPUTE ABOUT GREATNESS

Matthew 18:1, Mark 9:33, Luke 9:46 and Saying 12a

These three parallel verses provide the introductions of the three Synoptic Evangelists to the pericope concerning true greatness. As each of these introductions differ, so also do the pericopes themselves. The degree of verbal dissimilarity leads one to conclude that both Matthew and Luke may have used other sources than Mark in preparing their pericopes.[1]

The few possibilities of editorial work that do exist lie in these introductory verses. In Mark's account the naming of Capernaum is most likely Marcan since neither Matthew nor Luke give that setting.[2] In Matthew's account the question of who is the greatest is expanded by use of a Matthean theme "the kingdom of heaven." Only in Matthew do the disciples initiate the discussion by their own question so that both the Marcan and Lukan versions appear on that account to be secondary.[3] If, on the other hand, that difference is viewed from the viewpoint of the tendency to move from indirect to direct speech, Matthew's version is an example of a change in that direction, though that change cannot be attributed to Matthew himself with any certainty.[4] The reading "a discussion arose among them" in Luke 17:6 may represent a Lukan improvement of Mark.[5] The word διαλογισμός appears quite frequently in Luke as do compound verbs. To designate such peculiarities as proven redactional traits is, however, difficult.

---

[1] Cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 277.

[2] Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 65; Schmidt, Der Rahmen, p. 230.

[3] Bultmann, History, pp. 66, 199.

Thomas Saying 12a reads:

> The disciples said to Jesus: We know that you will go away from us. Who is he who will then be great over us?

Saying 12a seems to represent still another tradition which developed out of the dispute of the disciples. Because the disciples ask the question in Saying 12a, it agrees with the Matthean account, at the same time, the question itself adds an entirely new element about going away and is lacking the Matthean reference to the kingdom of heaven.[6] Saying 12a's use of the first person plural is witnessed otherwise only in Mark-sa 9:34, but this tells nothing about the Greek source either. The fact that the rest of Saying 12a continues with a completely different answer strengthens the probability that no literary dependence was at work here either. The only certain editorial trait, the localization at Capernaum, is missing.

---

[4] Bultmann, History, pp. 312, 330.

[5] Klostermann, Lukasevangelium, p. 109.

[6] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 51, agrees that dependence cannot be concluded on this point.

Matthew 18:1	Mark 9:33-34	Luke 9:46	Thomas 12a
	[33] Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρ-		
	ναούμ. καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γε-		
	νόμενος ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς·		
	τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ διελογίζεσθε;	[46] Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς	
[1] Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ προσ-	[34] οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων·	ἐν αὐτοῖς,	
ῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ			ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ
Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες· τίς ἄρα	πρὸς ἀλλή-		ⲛ̄ⲓ̄ⲥ̄ ϫⲉ ⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ϫⲉ ⲕⲛⲁ
μείζων ἐστὶν	λους γὰρ διελέχθησαν ἐν	τὸ τίς	ⲃⲱⲕ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲉⲧⲛⲁⲣ
	τῇ ὁδῷ τίς μείζων	ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν	ⲛⲟϭ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉϫⲱⲛ
ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρα-			
νῶν.			

CHAPTER XXXII

FAITH MOVES MOUNTAINS

Matthew 17:20 and 18:19, Mark 11:23, Luke 17:6
and Sayings 48 and 106

The saying about the faith that can move mountains occurs four times in our Synoptic Gospels: Mark 11:23/Matthew 21:21, Matthew 17:20 and Luke 17:6. The saying has the general form: If you have faith, say to this mountain (Luke--tree) be moved and it will be moved.[1] The degree of verbal identity is small, especially in the apodosis of the sentence.

The work of the Evangelists is evident chiefly in the positioning of the saying. Mark uses it as an example of how faith and prayer are related after the incident of the cursing of the fig tree. Matthew 21:21 follows Mark but with less emphasis on the prayer aspect so that the saying is more of an answer to the disciples amazement over the withering of the tree. In his second use of the saying (17:20) Matthew employs it once again in the context of miracles: You, too, could have healed this epileptic boy. Thus the words καὶ οὐδὲν ἀδυνατήσει ὑμῖν at the end of 17:20 are probably due to Matthew. In Luke the saying occurs in the context of sin, repentance and the forgiveness of a brother who repents: "Increase our faith! If you have faith you could uproot this tree."[2]

---

[1] Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp. 271-272.

Matthew 18:19 (If two of you agree on earth about anything . . .) comes from Matthew's special source.[3] The πάλιν may be a Matthean connecting link although the verse may have been joined to the preceding verses in Matthew's source by means of the catchwords ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.[4]

Thomas Saying 48 reads:

> Jesus said: If two make peace with one another in this same house, they will say to the mountain: Be moved and it will be moved.

Thomas Saying 106 reads:

> Jesus said: Whenever you make the two one, you shall become the sons of the man and whenever you say "Mountain, be moved," it will be moved.

Those who see Thomas as a user of our Synoptic Gospels claim that these two sayings are mosaics created out of Matthew 18:19 and 17:20.[5] For Schrage the case is completed by the fact that the translation of μεταβαίνειν by ⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ instead of ⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ occurs for the only times in Matthew-sa in this saying and in Thomas (the second occurrence of that word in Sayings 48 and 106). Since this Coptic evidence tells us nothing about the source of the Greek text, no literary dependence for Thomas can be concluded.

The freedom with which the Synoptic writers used the saying about faith moving mountains is evidence that it was in quite free circulation.[6]

---

[2] Cf. Bultmann, *History*, pp. 93-94. Harnack, *Sayings*, p. 91, along with many others assigns the "tree" reference to Luke.

[3] Schmidt, *Der Rahmen*, p. 229.

[4] M'Neile, *Matthew*, p. 267.

[5] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, p. 116; Grant-Freedman, *Secret Sayings*, p. 159; R. M. Grant, "Notes on the Gospel of Thomas," *VC*, 13(1959), 178.

[6] Paul also uses it without referring to the Gospels, I Cor. 13:2.

That it would be combined with other sayings was, therefore, quite possible. The mere fact of such a combination, however, does not betray a literary dependence. As a matter of fact, the protasis of the Thomas saying is something like Matthew 18:19 but is not that verse. Furthermore, the combination of the sayings was most likely not made by Thomas himself as the same combination is also quoted in the Syriac Didascalia[7] and therefore may have been due to another tradition.[8] The fact that the only editorial work of note in any of the four Synoptic versions of the saying occurs in Matthew 18:20 but not in either of Thomas' sayings is again the most significant point.[9] Thus, we can only conclude that there is no evidence on which to base a case for Thomas' use of our Synoptic Gospels in either of these sayings.

Added Note

The relationship between Saying 30, "Where there are three gods, they are gods; where there are two or one I am with him," and Matthew 18:20 provides no basis for assuming Thomas' dependence of Matthew. Once again Schrage's method of proof must rely on Thomas' relationship to the Sahidic translations.[10]

---

[7] Another evidence of the Syrian origins of Thomas.

[8] Wilson, Studies, p. 79; Puech, Hennecke-Schneemelcher, p. 302; H.-Ch. Puech, "Une collection des paroles de Jesus récemment retrouvé," Comptes rendus de L'Academie des Inscriptiones et Belles Lettres, (1957), 165.

[9] Since it would not necessarily refer to miracles when taken out of the Matthean context, Thomas' anti-miracle bias does not account for its omission.

[10] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 74-75.

Matthew 17:20	Matthew 18:19	Thomas 48	Thomas 106
[20] ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς· διὰ τὴν ὀλιγ- πιστίαν ὑμῶν· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐρεῖτε τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ· μετάβα ἔνθεν ἐκεῖ, καὶ μετα- βήσεται, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀδυνατήσει ὑμῖν.	[19] Πάλιν [ἀμὴν] λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν δύο συμφωνήσωσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς περὶ παντὸς πράγματος οὗ ἐὰν αἰτήσωνται, γενήσεται αὐτοῖς παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲣ̅ ⲉⲓⲣⲏⲛⲏ ⲙⲛ̅ ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ ϩⲙ̅ ⲡⲉⲓⲏⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲥⲉⲛⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲙ̅ⲡⲧⲁⲩ ϫⲉ ⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲩⲱ ϥⲛⲁⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ϩⲟⲧⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ϣⲁⲣ ⲡⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲟⲩⲁ· ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̅ϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ̅ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ϣⲁⲛϫⲟ ⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ· ϥⲛⲁⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE LOST SHEEP

Matthew 18:12-14, Luke 15:3-7 and Saying 107

Matthew and Luke present quite different versions of the same parable. Bultmann is probably correct in preferring Matthew's short introduction, "What seems best to you" over Luke's longer and more prosaic "and he told them this parable, saying."[1] Likewise Matthew 18:13 is probably to be preferred over Luke 3:7 because the latter makes the parable apply explicitly to lost sinners.[2] Matthew 18:14 is also secondary for a similar reason, that is it limits the meaning of the parable to the Church.

Thomas Saying 107 reads:

> Jesus said: The kingdom is like a man, a shepherd, who had one hundred sheep. One of them, the largest one, went astray. He left the ninety-nine, he sought that one until he found it. When he exerted himself, he said to the sheep: I love you more than the ninety-nine.

The case for Thomas' use of our Synoptic Gospels for his version of the parable is made chiefly by Schrage.[3] He again finds Thomas to be a mixed text sharing with Luke the ἔχων and the ἕως phrase, and with Matthew the seeking as well as the statement form. His major argument is from the agreement of Thomas with Luke-sa in including the phrases about seeking which are due to parallel influence. As we have argued in many places, this influence may be true for the Coptic Thomas but it cannot establish the sources of the Thomas.

---

[1] Bultmann, *History*, p. 171. Cf. Harnack, *Sayings*, pp. 92-93.

[2] Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, pp. 132-135, argues for the opposite opinion, that the Lukan context, Jesus' defence of fellowship with sinners, is the original. However, the collection of similar parables in Luke 15 argues against that context as original.

[3] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, pp. 194-196.

It is again significant that the possible editorial verses from both Matthew and Luke are totally absent in Thomas' version. This fact coupled with two of Thomas' other peculiarities make Thomas' independence from our Synoptics much more probable than the reverse. First, in Thomas the parable is a kingdom parable. Although most seem to assume that this change was made by Thomas, there is no reason for assigning it to him, especially when both Synoptic contexts also pose problems. Secondly, Thomas does, like our Gospels, use a comparative construction but a different one, witnessed to by the Greek word παρά in Thomas' text.[4] Thomas would not have changed from μᾶλλον to παρά for gnostic reasons. Thus it seems that once again Thomas merely represents a different line of the development of the tradition than do our Synoptic Gospels, and its secondary features as well as its gnostic ones, ought not to surprise us.

---

[4] Till, *Koptische Grammatik*, section 151, p. 77, shows that the the Coptic had its own ways of expressing this idea.

Matthew 18:12-13	Luke 15:3-5	Thomas 107
	[3] εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ
[12] τί ὑμῖν	παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγων·	ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲉⲥⲧⲛ̅
δοκεῖ; ἐὰν γένηταί τινι ἀνθρώ-	[4] τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔχων	ⲧⲱⲛ ⲉⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̅ϣⲱⲥ ⲉⲩⲛ̅ⲧⲁϥ
πῳ ἑκατὸν πρόβατα καὶ πλανηθῇ	ἑκατὸν πρόβατα καὶ ἀπολέσας ἐξ	ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̅ϣⲉ ⲛ̅ⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲁⲟⲩⲁ ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ
ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν, οὐχὶ ἀφήσει τὰ ἐνε-	αὐτῶν ἓν οὐ καταλείπει τὰ ἐνε-	ⲉⲡⲛⲟϭ ⲡⲉ ⲁϥⲕⲱ ⲙ̅ⲡⲥⲧⲯⲓⲧ
νήκοντα ἐννέα ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη καὶ	νήκοντα ἐννέα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ	
πορευθεὶς ζητεῖ τὸ πλανώμενον;	πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπολωλὸς ἕως	ⲁϥϣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ⲥⲁ ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲁ ϣⲁⲛ
[13] καὶ ἐὰν γένηται εὑρεῖν αὐτό	εὕρῃ αὐτό;	ⲧⲉϥϩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥϩⲓⲥⲉ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ
		ⲙ̅ⲡⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉ ϯⲟⲩⲟϣⲕ ⲡⲁⲣⲁ ⲡⲥⲧⲉ
ἀμὴν λέγω	[5] καὶ εὑρὼν ἐπιτίθησιν ἐπὶ	ⲯⲓⲧ
ὑμῖν ὅτι χάρει ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ	τοὺς ὤμους αὐτοῦ χαίρων	
μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐνενήκοντα		
ἐννέα τοῖς μὴ πεπλανημένοις.		

CHAPTER XXXIV

COMMISSIONING THE SEVENTY

Matthew 9:37-38 and 10:16, Luke 10:2, 7-8
and Sayings 73, 39b, 14b

The Lukan pericope (10:2-12) is the result of Luke's tendency not to conflate his sources but to place them side by side. Thus, he places a sending out of the twelve in 9:1ff. (from Mark) and the sending out of the seventy here. Verse 1 is Luke's introduction to the pericope.[1] Matthew 9:37-38 and 10:16 are likewise parts of Q, as Matthew, unlike Luke, combined Q with Mark to produce one account. Matthew 10:16's "he said to his disciples" may be more original than Luke's "he said to them."[2] The τότε certainly belongs to Matthew's work. Matthew 10:16b about the serpents and doves was originally a secular proverb; it is lacking in Luke.[3]

Thomas Saying 73 reads:

> Jesus said: The harvest is great, but the laborers are few; but pray the Lord to send laborers out into the harvest.

Since this saying agrees very closely with the Synoptic version, nothing can be said about its source. The Synoptic accounts come from

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 334.

[2] Manson, Sayings, p. 74.

[3] Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 103; M'Neile, Matthew, p. 139.

Q. The Coptic evidence presented by Schrage is relevant for the Coptic Thomas but not for the question of sources.[4]

Thomas Saying 39b reads:

> But become wise as serpents and innocent
> as doves.

Once again the text of Thomas is very close to that of Matthew, but this does not prove Thomas' dependence on Matthew. The saying itself was probably a freely circulating proverb, and it is here separated completely from its Matthean context.[5]

Thomas Saying 14b reads:

> And if you go into any region and travel in the regions,
> if they receive you, eat that which they place before you,
> heal the sick among them.

Grant-Freedman,[6] Gärtner[7] and Wilson[8] feel that this saying provides evidence that Thomas used our Synoptic Gospels. The basis of their contention is that the phrase "heal the sick" is out of place in Thomas' context and must be due to Thomas' source of Luke. Schrage correctly recognizes that Luke is presenting Q here so that such a conclusion cannot be reached.[9] He finds also that Thomas' reading of "among them" rather than "heal . . . in it" is shared by Luke-sa. This of course, shows us nothing about sources either. Thus, none of these sayings from Thomas are conclusive evidence for sources.

---

[4] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 153-154.

[5] Cf. Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 94-95.

[6] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 133; Grant, VC, XIII(1959), 176.

[7] Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, pp. 35-36.

[8] Wilson, Studies, pp. 70-71.

[9] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 52-54.

Matthew 9:37-38	Luke 10:2	Thomas 73
[37]Τότε λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολύς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι· [38]δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ.	[2]ἔλεγεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολύς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι· δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ ὅπως ἐργάτας ἐκβάλῃ εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲡⲱϩⲥ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲛⲁϣⲱϥ ⲛⲉⲣⲅⲁⲧⲏⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲥⲟⲃⲕ ⲥⲟⲡⲥ̄ ⲇⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ϣⲓⲛⲁ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲛⲉϫ ⲉⲣⲅⲁⲧⲏⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲡⲱϩⲥ
Matthew 10:16 [16b]γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί.		Thomas 39b ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲇⲉ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲫⲣⲟⲛⲓⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛ︦ϩⲟϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲁⲕⲉⲣⲁⲓ̈ⲟⲥ ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲛ̄ϭⲣⲟⲙ'ⲡⲉ
	Luke 10:7-9a [7]ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε, ἔσθοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν· ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ. μὴ μεταβαίνετε ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν. [8]καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε καὶ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα ὑμῖν, [9]καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσθενεῖς,	Thomas 14b ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϣⲁⲛⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲕⲁϩ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲙⲟⲟϣⲉ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲭⲱⲣⲁ ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛⲡⲁⲣⲁⲇⲉⲭⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲁⲕⲁⲁϥ ϩⲁⲣⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲟⲙϥ̄ ⲛⲉⲧϣⲱⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲓⲑⲉⲣⲁⲡⲉⲩⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ

CHAPTER XXXV

THE BLESSEDNESS OF JESUS' MOTHER

Luke 11:27-28 and 23:29 and Saying 79

The pericope about the blessedness of Jesus' mother, Luke 11:27-28, is found only in Luke. It is to be classified as a biographical apophthegm constructed around verses 29-31.[1] The numerous examples of such blessings from Strach-Billerbeck listed by Bultmann show that they were indeed typical in Judaism. The verses constitute a unified section "with its point in the opposition to the Jewish outlook of verse 27."[2] The introductory words of verse 27 *Ἐγένετο* . . . *αὐτόν* provide a typical Lukan connecting link.[3]

Likewise Luke 23:27-31 comprises another section peculiar to Luke, yet one which appears to have come to him through the tradition. Bultmann points out its Aramaic character,[4] and Dibelius notes that verse 31 presupposes a situation quite different from the Passion narrative into which Luke has placed it.[5]

Thomas Saying 79 reads:

---

[1] Bultmann, *History*, p. 30.

[2] Bultmann, *History*, p. 30. Cf. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 115; Manson, *Sayings*, p. 85.

[3] Manson, *Sayings*, p. 88; Klostermann, *Lukasevangelium*, p. 128.

[4] Bultmann, *History*, p 115.

[5] Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 203, n. 1.

> A woman in the crowd said to him: Blessed is the womb which bore you and the breasts which nourished you. He said to her: Blessed are those who have heard the word of the Father, they have kept it in truth. For the days will come and you (pl.) will say: Blessed is the womb which has not conceived and the breasts which have not given milk.

Those who support the position that Thomas used our Synoptic Gospels as his sources claim that Saying 79 is a combination of Luke 11:27-28 and 23:29.[6] Schrage even claims that the words about the woman speaking from the crowd are a part of the Lukan introduction to the saying. That is highly unlikely; the construction of the apophthegm is not to be assigned to Luke himself as we have seen above. The differences between Thomas' saying and verses 27-28 such as the secondary change of God to Father also tell nothing about Thomas' source. However, Saying 79a does contain the combination "hear and do the word of my Father" which may be Lukan.[7] It may, however, be due to Luke's source since he did not construct the apophthegm.[8]

For the second half of Saying 79 Schrage claims certain dependence on Luke because the second person plural of you will say can only be understood on the basis of similar plurals in the Lukan context. It is true that that person and number seem to be related to the context of the saying as it is found in Luke, but that context cannot be attributed to Luke's authorship, so that the relationship proves nothing about Thomas' sources. Thomas' source could have been the same as Luke's, or it could have been another tradition of the same type.[9] Schrage would also have us see Thomas' ⲅⲁⲣ as an attempt to avoid identification with Luke 23:29. Rather, since the old Syriac also has that reading, it is at least possible that it represents an alternate translation of the Aramaic ד. That Thomas shared a modern concern about sources is highly improbable and has not been proven by anyone.

---

[6] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 165-166; Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, p. 252; Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 179. Cf. Haenchen, Botschaft, p. 55; Wilson, Studies, p. 81.

[7] Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, pp. 34, 231.

[8] The same reading occurs in Q, Matthew 7:24/Luke 6:47.

---

[9] Quispel, *VC*, XI(1957), 200-201, lists this same reading as one which has many old Syriac parallels. Bultmann, *History*, p. 37, describes the apophthegm as a construction but refuses to say it is Luke's construction.

Luke 11:27-28	Thomas 79
[27] Ἐγένετο δὲ τῷ λέγειν αὐτὸν ταῦτα ἐπαρασά τις φωνὴν γυνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου εἶπεν αὐτῷ· μακαρία ἡ κολία ἡ βαστασασά σε καὶ μαστοὶ οὓς ἐθήλασας. [28] αὐτὸς δὲ εἶπεν· μενοῦν μακάριοι οἱ ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ φυλάσσοντες.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲟⲩⲥϩⲓⲙ[ⲉ] ⲛⲁϥ ϩⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲏⲏϣⲉ ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲁⲧ[ⲥ ⲛ̄]ⲑϩⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϩⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲕ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲕⲓⲃⲉ ⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲥⲁⲛⲟⲩϣⲕ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁ[ⲥ] ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ ⲁⲡⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲁⲩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲉ
Luke 23:29	
[29] ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἔρχονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς εροῦσιν· μακάριαι, αἱ στεῖραι, καὶ αἱ κολίαι αἳ οὐκ ἐγέννησαν, καὶ μαστοὶ οἳ οὐκ ἔθρεψαν.	ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ϩⲛ̄ϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ϫⲟⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲁⲧⲥ̄ ⲛ̄ⲑϩⲏ ⲧⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲥⲱ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲕⲓⲃⲉ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲙⲡⲟⲩϯ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲉ

CHAPTER XXXVI

THE PARABLE OF THE RICH MAN

Luke 12:13-21 and Sayings 72 and 63

This part (Luke 12:13-21) of Luke's Gospel is composed of two separate sections, verses 13-15 and verses 16-21.

In the first Jesus warns a man who asks him to become a party to a dispute about a family inheritance against an avarice for material possessions. The section comprises a unity since Jesus' answer would be meaningless without the man's question.[1] The words "of the crowd" may well be Luke's attempt to bind this pericope with what has preceded.[2] Luke clearly uses this apophthegm as an introduction to the Parable of the Rich Fool.[3]

The second part of the Lukan pericope is the Parable of the Rich Fool. Its insertion at this point is the work of Luke.[4] Luke is also responsible for the introduction in verse 16a.[5] The point of the parable is an eschatological one: The hearers are to see the unpreparedness of the rich man which could be their own state in the eschaton.[6] Verse 21 gives a secondary interpretation of the parable.[7]

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 23.

[2] Manson, Sayings, p. 271; Klostermann, Lukasevangelium, p. 135. Luke 12:1 also uses ὄχλος.

[3] The two εἶπεν δὲ make this clear. Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 23; Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte, p. 161; Jeremias, Gleichnisse, pp. 164-165. For a contrary opinion, Manson, Sayings, p. 271.

[4] Bultmann, History, p. 178.

[5] Cf. Luke 12:22, 14:7, 15:3, et al.

Thomas Saying 72 reads:

> A man said to him: Speak to my brothers in order that they may divide my father's possessions with me. He said to him: O man, who made me a divider? He turned to his disciples. He said to them, I am not a divider, am I?

Thomas Saying 63 reads:

> Jesus said: There was a rich man who had many possessions. He said: I will use my money to sow and reap and plant and fill my storehouses with fruit in order that I may lack nothing. This was what he thought in his heart and that night he died. He who has ears let him hear.

Most of the discussion about Saying 72 is over its meaning in a gnostic setting, which is evidently that Jesus comes to restore man to his true unity.[8] However, Schrage claims the saying is evidence for Thomas' use of Luke, largely on the basis of several secondary factors in Thomas' saying.[9] These, as has been said before, actually prove nothing about Thomas' sources. The fact that Thomas is again lacking the only possible editorial addition to the saying *ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου* is quite embarrassing to Schrage. He explains it after much verbage as due to the separation of the saying from its Lukan context. This is a possible but hardly the more probable occurrence.

In spite of the great differences between Saying 63 and the Parable of the Rich Fool--even the main characters are considerably different--

---

[6] Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, p. 165.

[7] Bultmann, *History*, p. 178. Cf. Manson, *Sayings*, p. 272.

[8] Haenchen, *Botschaft*, pp. 53-54. Cf. I Cor. 1:13.

[9] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, pp. 151-152, points out such things as the replacement of *κληρονομία* by "my father's possessions," the

some still claim that Thomas' account is merely an abbreviation of that Lukan parable.[10] Schrage, on the other hand, is correctly quite dubious of any such attempts.[11] As he points out, many of the changes simply cannot be explained, even for gnostic reasons. The secondary characteristics of this parable are, of course, no evidence of Lukan origins.

There is in these two sayings certain evidence that they did not come from Luke. First of all, it is almost surely Luke's work in placing them together in Luke 12; yet, they are completely separate in Thomas. Wilson notes further that the next block of material from Luke 12 is found in still another place, Saying 36.[12] Such separations do not readily suggest Luke as a source. Secondly, several readings in both sayings suggest, not a secondary development of the Lukan text, but a development of another text entirely. Such evidences are the ἵνα for purpose in Saying 72 where Luke's Greek uses an infinitive, the change in the situation of the Rich Man in Saying 63, the use of a ἵνα in the same saying, and the lack of the word ἀναπαύω in Thomas. Especially the latter would be very hard to explain in a gnostic recension. Thus, Luke could hardly have been the source of these sayings.

---

omission of δέ in Sahidic MS 129, and the omission of the vocative, "teacher."

[10] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 169. Cf. Haenchen, ThR, XXVII(1961-1962), 175.

[11] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 131-133. Cf. Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, p. 46, n. 1.

[12] Wilson, Studies, p. 99.

Luke 12:13-21	Thomas 72
[13] Εἶπεν δέ τις ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, εἰπὲ τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου μερίσασθαι μετ᾽ἐμοῦ τὴν κληρονομίαν. [14] ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἄνθρωπε, τίς με κατέστησεν κριτὴν ἢ μεριστὴν ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς; [15] εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· ὁρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε ἀπὸ πάσης πλεονεξίας, ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ.	[ⲡⲉϫ]ⲉ ⲟ[ⲩ ⲣⲱⲙⲉ] ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲛⲁⲥⲛⲏⲩ ϣⲓⲛⲁ ⲉⲩⲛ[ⲁ]ⲡⲱϣⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛϩⲁⲁⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲉⲓ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲱ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁϩⲁⲁⲧ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥⲡⲱϣⲉ ⲁϥⲕⲟⲧϥ̄ ⲁⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲩ ϫⲉ ⲙⲏ ⲉⲉⲓϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥⲡⲱϣⲉ
	Thomas 63
[16] Εἶπεν δὲ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων· ἀνθρώπου τινὸς πλουσίου εὐφόρησεν ἡ χώρα. [17] καὶ διελογίζετο ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγων· τί ποιήσω, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συνάξω τοὺς καρπούς μου; [18] καὶ εἶπεν· τοῦτο ποιήσω· καθελῶ μου τὰς ἀποθήκας καὶ μείζονας οἰκοδομήσω, καὶ συνάξω ἐκεῖ πάντα τὸν σῖτον καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά μου, [19] καὶ ἐρῶ τῇ ψυχῇ μου· ψυχή, ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ κείμενα εἰς ἔτη πολλά· ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου. [20] εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ θεός· ἄφρων, ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ· ἃ δὲ ἡτοίμασας, τίνι ἔσται; [21] οὕτως ὁ θησαυρίζων αὐτῷ καὶ μὴ εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̄ⲥ̄ ϫⲉ ⲛⲉⲩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲗⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲥ ⲉⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ϩⲁϩ ⲛ̄ⲭⲣⲏⲙⲁ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ϫⲉ ϯⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲭⲣⲱ ⲛ̄ⲭⲣⲏⲙⲁ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲉⲉⲓⲛⲉϫⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲱⲥϩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲱϭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲙⲟⲩϩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲉϩⲱⲣ ⲛ̄ⲕⲁⲣⲡⲟⲥ ϣⲓⲛⲁ ϫⲉ ⲛⲓⲣ̄ ϭⲣⲱϩ ⲗ̄ⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲉϥⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉϥϩⲏⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲟⲩϣⲏ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲁϥⲙⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲩⲙ̄ ⲙⲁϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄.

CHAPTER XXXVII

INTERPRETING THE TIMES

Luke 12:54-56 and Saying 91

This Lukan pericope about man's inability to understand the seriousness of the coming eschaton has a secondary parallel in Matthew 16:3. The Matthean verse, which is not contained in the oldest MSS is most probably a scribal imitation of Luke's verse.[1] Since the Lukan verses contain no reference to the person of Jesus, it is most likely that they come from him and not from the Church.[2] Matthew 16:1f which introduces the Matthean version of the saying is a Matthean redaction of Mark 8:11. Luke's τοῖς ὄχλοις may be redactional as the term is a favorite with him.[3]

Thomas Saying 91 reads:

> They said to him: Tell us who you are in order that we might believe in you. He said to them: You test the face of heaven and earth, and you have not known him who is before you, and you do not know how to test this time.

Schrage[4] and Grant-Freedman[5] both see this saying as a combination of elements from Matthew 16:3 and from Luke 12:56. Schrage mentions the possibility that the Matthean account is secondary but goes on to assume agreements of Thomas and Luke as over against Matthew; for example, Thomas like Luke adds τῆς γῆς to τὸ πρόσωπον. Since the Matthean form is clearly secondary, only agreements with it would have been meaningful in the question of sources. That Thomas' πειράζειν is from Matthew 16:1 as Schrage suggests is improbable because the testing in that verse (and in Mark 8:11 from which it is derived) is a testing of Jesus. In Thomas Jesus says that his opponents do not know how to "interpret" the sky. Furthermore, Matthew 16:1 names Jesus' opponents as the Pharisees and Sadducees while Thomas does not. Matthew, not Thomas, would be secondary under such a comparison.[6]

---

[1] Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 116; Manson, Sayings, p. 121; M'Neile, Matthew, p. 235.

[2] Bultmann, History, pp. 116, 126.

[3] Cf. Luke 3:7, 3:10, 7:24, 9:11, 13:14, etc.

[4] Schrage, Das Verhaltnis, pp. 175-177. Cf. Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, p. 140; Kasser, L'Évangile selon Thomas, p. 106.

[5] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, pp. 184-185.

Wilson's description of the saying is well put. We find, he says, "the same curious mixture of Synoptic material and other elements, of compression and of expansion."[7] After giving no evidence of Thomas' dependence on our Gospels, however, he concludes that Saying 91 represents an example of a saying torn from its context and reworked to suit a new purpose.[8]

Saying 91 does, in fact, represent a gnosticized reworking of the saying we have known from Luke 12:56.[9] There is no evidence that 12:56 was Thomas' source of the saying. The question and answer introduction to a saying, as *Pistis Sophia* illustrates, was a favorite in gnosticism and need not be attributed to Matthew 16:1 or John 8. That the questioners in Saying 91 may be either opponents or disciples without affecting the meaning of the saying is another indication that the introduction is merely a sterile construction. Furthermore, neither Luke's *τοῖς ὄχλοις* nor the word *ὑποκριταί* from his source appear in Thomas, while Thomas' use of the *περάζειν* suggests a different tradition of the saying than Luke's.

---

[6] Bultmann, *History*, pp. 52, 67f.

[7] Wilson, *Studies*, p. 65.

[8] Wilson, *Studies*, p. 66.

[9] Gärtner, *Theology of . . . Thomas*, pp. 139-140; Haenchen, *Botschaft*, p. 64; Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, pp. 176-177.

Luke 12:54a, 56	Thomas 91
	ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ ϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲕ ⲛⲓⲙ ϣⲓⲛⲁ
[54a] ⸀Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς ⸀ὄχλοις·	ⲉⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲡⲓⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲩ ϫⲉ
[56] ὑποκριταί, τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ	ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲣ̄ⲡⲓⲣⲁⲍⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡϩⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲉ ⲙⲛ̄
οὐρανοῦ ⸀οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν,	ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲧⲟ
τὸν καιρὸν	ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ
δὲ τοῦτον πῶς οὐ δοκιμάζετε.	ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲣ̄ⲡⲓⲣⲁⲍⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

ON THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

Luke 17:20-21 and Sayings 3a and 113

This short pericope is composed of a dominical saying about the suddennes of the coming of the kingdom of God and of a stylized introduction which may be the work of Luke. The latter is formed on the model used by Greek philosophical apophthegms according to Bultmann.[1] Its formal characteristics are ἐπερωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ ... εἶπεν.[2] The question itself is a natural introduction to the saying and can hardly be attributed to Luke.[3] The same form of an introduction and almost the same question are quoted in 2 Clement XII, 2.[4] The answer given in 2 Clement, however, is an apocryphal saying which appears in Thomas without that introduction as Saying 22. Thus, it would appear that this introductory formula was well-known and used rather freely. The saying itself about the kingdom being in the midst of the disciples emphasizes the suddenness of its coming and is not intended as a spiritualization of the kingdom forced by the delay of the Parousia. It is regarded by all as genuine.[5]

---

[1] Bultmann, *History*, pp. 25, 335. Cf. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, pp. 162-163; Klostermann, *Lukasevangelium*, p. 174.

[2] The naming of the Pharisees is certainly a secondary element. Bultmann, *History*, p. 53.

[3] Cf. Mark 13:4par; Mark 13:33 and 35; Acts 1:16.

[4] "II Clement," *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. I; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), p. 146: ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπὸ τινος, πότε ἥξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία εἶπεν.

Thomas Saying 3a reads:

> Jesus said: If those who lead you say to you; Behold the kingdom is in heaven, then the birds of heaven will precede you. If they say to you; Behold, it is in the sea, then the fish will precede you. But the kingdom is within you and outside of you.

Thomas Saying 113 reads:

> His disciples said to him: Then what day will the kingdom come? Jesus said It will not come upon expectation. They will not say: Behold here or behold there. But the kingdom of the Father is spread out on the earth and men do not see it.

Both of these sayings have been claimed as evidence that Thomas used Luke as one of his sources. Wilson,[6] Grant-Freedman,[7] and Gärtner[8] are all content with such a solution. Schrage feels that no definite decision can be reached on the basis of Saying 3 alone[9] but that Saying 113 proves the dependence of both.[10] The burden of proof is placed upon the fact that Thomas introduces the saying with the same question "When will the kingdom come?" as does Luke. He explains the change in Thomas from παρατήρησις (observation) to ϭⲱϣⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ = ἀποκαραδοκία (expectation) as due to the gnostic correction of the eschatology of the saying. As supporting evidence, he notes that the Sahidic witnesses share Thomas' omissions of γάρ.

---

[5] Bultmann, History, pp. 25, 54, 121; Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte, pp. 162-163; Manson, Sayings, p. 303; Conzelmann, Theology of St. Luke, pp. 121-122.

[6] Wilson, Studies, p. 82.

[7] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, pp. 120-122.

[8] Gartner, Theology of . . . Thomas, p. 213.

[9] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 30-32.

[10] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 199-200.

If the question about the time of the coming of the kingdom were Lukan, then the appearance of that question in Thomas would prove that Luke was in some way a source of Thomas. We have already shown that the question itself is an example of a common eschatological concern and that it is the form of the introduction itself which is Lukan. Thomas does not witness to that form in either Saying 3 or Saying 113. Saying 3 is initiated by Jesus in Thomas' usual manner; Saying 113 begins with a brief introduction, but with a direct question by Jesus' disciples rather than the formula used by Luke. Thus, there is no proof of Lukan origin from the editorial evidence.

The other evidence also does not support a case for Thomas' dependence on Luke for these two sayings. Both sayings obviously contain secondary developments[11] but this in itself tells us nothing about Thomas' sources. Some additions are gnostically motivated, such as the "outside of you" in Saying 3. However, Schrage's explanation of the change from "observation" to "expectation" on the basis of a gnostic bias is without basis. The use of the word ἀποκαραδοκία in Romans 8:19, for example, is certainly an eschatological use of the word. Thomas' interpretation of the saying is actually based on his acceptance of the meaning "within you" for ἐντὸς ὑμῶν. These two sayings, thus, do represent the gnostic use of and expansion of two Synoptic sayings. There is no evidence from editorial analysis that Luke was the source of the sayings for Thomas.

---

[11] Such as the expansions of "here" and "there" in Saying 3 and the addition of "the Father" to kingdom in Saying 113.

Luke 17:20-21	Pap. Ox. 654, 2	Thomas 3	Thomas 113
[20] Ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν			ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ ⲛⲁϥ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲛⲉϥⲙⲁⲑ
φαρισαίων πότε ἔρχεται ἡ			ⲏⲧⲏⲥ ϫⲉ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲉⲥⲛ̄
βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀπεκρί-			ⲛⲏⲩ ⲛⲁϣ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲟⲩ
θη αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν· οὐκ	λέγει Ἰησοῦς·	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ	
ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θε-			ⲉⲥⲛ̄ⲛⲏⲩ ⲁⲛ
οῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως,			ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩϭⲱϣⲧ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
[21] οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν·	ἐὰν ἕλκοντες ὑμᾶς εἴπωσιν	ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲱⲕ	ⲉⲩⲛⲁϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉ
ἰδοὺ ὧδε	ὑμῖν· ἰδοὺ ἡ βασιλεία ἐν	ϩⲏⲧ ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ̄ ϫⲉ ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧ	ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲓⲥⲁ
	οὐρα[νῷ, ὑμᾶς φθήσεται] τὰ	ⲉⲣⲟ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲡⲉ ⲉⲉⲓⲉ ⲛ̄ϩⲁⲗⲏⲧ	
ἤ	πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρ[α]νοῦ. ἐὰν	ⲛⲁⲣ̄ ϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲡⲉ	ⲏ
ἐκεῖ·	δ᾽ εἴπωσιν ὅ]τι ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν	ⲉⲩϣⲁⲛϫⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ̄ ϫⲉ ⲥϩⲛ̄	ⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲧⲏ
	ἐστ[ι]ν, εἰσελεύσονται] οἱ ἰχ-	ⲑⲁⲗⲁⲥⲥⲁ ⲉⲉⲓⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲃⲏⲧ ⲛⲁⲣ̄	
	θύες τῆς θαλά[σσης φθάσαν]	ϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̄	
ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία	τες ὑμᾶς καὶ ἡ βασιλεία	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁ
τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν.	τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν [ἐ]στι	ⲥⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲛ	ⲉⲓⲱⲧ.
	[κἀκτός.]	ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲃⲁⲗ	ⲉⲥⲡⲟⲣϣ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
			ϩⲓϫⲙ̄ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲣ̄ⲣⲱⲙⲉ
			ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ

CHAPTER XXXIX

THE WARNING OF THE PAROUSIA

Matthew 24:37-40, Luke 17:26-35 and Saying 61a

This pericope contains two sayings from Q: Matthew 24:37-39/ Luke 17:26-27 which compares the parousia to the days of Noah; Matthew 24:40/Luke 17:34-35 which warns that not all will be accepted at the parousia. Luke has inserted verses 30-33 into this Q setting. Verse 32 may be his own construction.[1]

The Matthean version of the second of these sayings says that of two in a field one will be taken; the Lukan version says that of two in a bed one will be taken. Bultmann feels that Matthew's version misses the point of the saying, that is, the original point of both the Noah saying and this one must have been the suddenness of the coming of the parousia.[2] Matthew's version is concerned only with the fact that a division will occur. Other scholars feel that this difference is due simply to the different versions of Q.[3] In any case, the Lukan reading is to be preferred as the more original since the change from the reading "bed" to that of "field" is easier to understand than the reverse. Matthew's τότε at 24:40 is the only editorial trace that can be noted with any certainty.[4]

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 117.

[2] Bultmann, History, p. 117.

[3] Manson, Sayings, pp. 145-146, argues against the authenticity of Luke 17:36 because it is written in Luke's style. Klostermann, Lukasevangelium, pp. 176-177, argues that Luke's reading of "at night" cannot be the original. Both of these objections to the originality of Luke miss the point of the saying in the same way that Matthew did.

Thomas Saying 61a reads:

> Jesus said: Two will be resting there on a bed.
> One will die, one will live.

Despite the paucity of evidence some hold that Saying 61a is based on Luke 17:34.[5] Since there is no editorial evidence in his opinion, Schrage centers his examination solely on the Coptic and textual critical evidence and finds that Thomas like Luke-sa repeats ουα twice and that Thomas' omissions of μιᾶς and ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί are attested elsewhere too. He ascribes Thomas' substitution of "live" and "die" for "taken" and "not taken" to the free quotation of the saying by Thomas. He finds gnostic meanings elsewhere for the Synoptic terms so that the substitution may not be gnostically motivated.

The only editorial traces are, of course, lacking once again. The lack of Matthew's τότε is no surprise since Thomas' saying is closer to the Lukan form. There is no evidence, either, of the Lukan interpolation of verses 30-33 in Saying 61a. The lack of verse 33 is especially important since the same saying occurs in Matthew 10:39 in connection with the saying about the conditions of discipleship (see above). Although Thomas gives that saying twice in Sayings 55 and 101, this saying about saving and losing one's life is omitted there also. Thus, it seems clear that Thomas knew neither Luke 17:34, its Lukan context, nor Matthew 10:37-38, its Matthean context. The secondary developments indicated by the substitutions of "live" and "die" and by the different order of their appearance in Thomas suggests that Thomas received the saying from an oral tradition rather than from Luke. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that the Greek words ἀνάπαυσις - ἀναπαύω may well have been the catchwords by which Sayings 60 and 61 were joined in the Greek Thomas.

---

[4] Bultmann, History, p. 350, lists it as one of his common connectors.

[5] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 167; Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, pp. 170-171; Kasser, L'Evangile selon Thomas, p. 86.

Matthew 24:40-41	Luke 17:34-35	Thomas 61a
[40] τότε ἔσονται δύο ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφίεται· [41] δύο ἀλήθουσαι ἐν τῷ μύλῳ, μία παραλαμβάνεται καὶ μία ἀφίεται.	[34] λέγω ὑμῖν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς, ὁ εἷς παραλημφθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος αφεθήσεται· [35] ἔσονται δύο ἀλήθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, ἡ μία παραλημφθήσεται ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα ἀφεθήσεται.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ⲟⲩⲛ̄ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲙⲧⲟⲛ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ϩⲓ ⲟⲩϭⲗⲟϭ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲛⲁⲱⲛϩ

CHAPTER XL

THE PARABLE OF THE WICKED HUSBANDMEN

Matthew 21:33-41, Mark 12:1-12, Luke 20:9-16
and Sayings 65 and 66

The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen occurs in all three Synoptic Gospels but in a somewhat different version in each. Although both Matthew and Luke follow Mark's text at times, at other times their readings diverge considerably from Mark and from each other.[1] Such differences suggest that Matthew and Luke each possessed another tradition of the parable besides that contained in Mark and that each combined or supplemented that tradition with Mark's account.[2] In all three Gospels the parable itself is followed by the addition of an Old Testament quotation, Ps. 118:22-23. It seems more probable that this addition is a secondary feature since it has no direct connection with the content of the parable. Bultmann attributes the addition to Mark, but an examination of Mark's citation formulas for such quotations leads to the conclusion that Mark found the two units already joined in his sources.[4] Whether the same was true in the sources of Matthew and Luke cannot be ascertained.[5]

---

[1] Matthew follows Mark closely in verses 1, 6, 10; Luke in verses 2, 4, 9. Matthew differs from both Mark and Luke in Matthew 21:33, 40, 43; Luke from both Mark and Matthew in Luke 20:12-13.

[2] Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp. 312-315, demonstrates very carefully the differences between Matthew and Mark. He finds such things as Matthew's very non-Greek (but possible Aramaic?) opening sentence which lays out the whole background of the parable, and as Matthew's lesser interest in the Christological aspects of the son. He concludes that both the Mattheam and Marcan texts represent different versions of the same basic parable.

[3] Bultmann, History, p. 177.

The major controversy over the parable is whether it was originally a parable or not. Jülicher, Bultmann and others of the same lineage hold that it is strictly an allegory, a construction of the community to illustrate the history of salvation.[6] Dodd, Jeremias and others maintain that what was once a parable has been transformed into an allegory in our Gospels.[7] Thus, there is complete agreement on the fact that the Synoptic Evangelists understood this to be an allegory; the question is whether it was always such, or whether it was originally a parable. Since the settlement of this issue does not directly bear on the question at hand and since Thomas' version of the parable has relevance for a decision, the question should be left open at this point.

The discovery of editorial traces within the parable itself is difficult and leads to uncertain results. From Mark only the introductory sentence "he began to speak to them in parables" can be taken as

---

[4] Mark commonly uses γέγραπται to introduce Old Testament quotes: 1:2, 7:6, 9:12, 13:13, 11:17, 14:21, 14:27. Only here does he use αἱ γραφαί.

[5] Luke's shortened quote could be his own abbreviation of Mark or from his separate source.

[6] Bultmann, History, pp. 177, 415.

[7] Dodd, Parables, pp. 127-132; Jeremias, Gleichnisse, pp. 67-69; Taylor, Mark, pp. 472-477. The two strongest arguments of this group are that not all the details of the Synoptic parable can have allegorical meaning and that the relationship between the accounts of Matthew and Mark and Isaiah 5:1-7 indicate a deliberate attempt to modify the parable to bring it in line with the passage from Isaiah.

Marcan.[8] But even there the plural of parables is difficult to ascribe to Mark who relates only one parable.[9] To Matthew we can perhaps attribute *ἀκούετε* in verse 33,[10] the temporal designations *ὅτε*, and *ὕστερον* in verses 34, and 37 respectively,[11] and verse 43 as a Matthean doublet of verse 41.[12] Luke is responsible for *πρὸς τὸν λαόν* in verse 9, perhaps for *χρόνους ἱκανούς* in verse 9, for *ἐξαποστέλλειν* in verse 10, *προτιθέναι*, *ἕτερος*, *δὲ καί* and *ἐξαποστέλλειν* in verse 11, *προτιθέναι*, *δὲ και*, and *τοῦτον* in verse 12,[13] perhaps for the introduction to the Psalm quote, and for the addition of still another "stone" saying in verse 18.

Thomas Saying 65 reads:

> He said: A good man had a vineyard. He gave it to husbandmen in order that they might cultivate it and that he might receive its fruit from them. He sent his servant in order that the husbandmen might give him fruits of the vineyard. They seized his servant, they beat him. A little longer and they would have killed him. The servant came. He told it to his master. His master said: Perhaps he did not know them. He sent another servant. The husbandmen beat him as well. Then the owner sent his son. He said: Perhaps they will respect my son. Since those husbandmen knew that he was the heir of the vineyard. They seized him, they killed him. He who has ears, let him hear.

---

[8] Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 238.

[9] Schmidt, *Der Rahmen*, pp. 287-288.

[10] Bultmann, *History*, p. 177.

[11] Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, p. 312.

[12] Bornkamm-Barth-Held, *Überlieferung*, p. 227; Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, p. 315.

[13] Ernst Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* ("Kritisch-Exegetische Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Begrundet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer," Dritte Abteilung, 13. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), p. 69, correctly warns against the acceptance of such words as surely Lukan. What we may understand by such designations is only that these words occur with relative frequency in Luke.

Thomas Saying 66 reads:

> Jesus said: Show me this stone which the builders rejected. It is the cornerstone.

Schrage's description of Saying 65 includes near its beginning these words:

> The shortened form of the parable, in which above all the lack of allegorical expansions is striking, could at first give the impression again that we might be concerned here with something like a prototype which lies behind the Synoptics and Thomas.[14]

His actual conclusion is exactly the opposite, of course, as he sees in Saying 66 the kind of mixed text he finds elsewhere in Thomas. Grant articulates quite clearly how such a mixing must have come about:

> In Saying 66 65 (the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen) "Thomas" (or his source) has carefully examined the Synoptic Gospels, with the result that at the beginning he omits details common to all three Gospels (Mark 12:1-12 and parallels).[15]

Whether Schrage would admit to such a precise understanding as Grant's or not, the intricate mixing of the texts of the Synoptics which he himself details can only be explained in such a way.[16] Yet such a deliberate mixing not only is difficult to ascribe to Thomas for technical reasons but also is completely lacking in purpose for him.

Schrage selects from all his data several agreements between Thomas and our Synoptic Gospels as agreements with redactional traits of the Evangelists.[17] He correctly claims that such agreements would be evidence that Thomas knew our Gospels. As important agreements with Matthew he takes Thomas' use of the possessive article with servant, the use of a substantive object in the seizing of the first servant and the omission of the phrases "sent him away empty-handed" and "beloved" (son). None of these are Matthean traits, they are simply readings of Matthew's text.[18]

---

[14] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 139.

[15] Grant, VC, XIII(1959), 178. [16] Schrage, Das Verhaltnis, pp. 137-140.

[17] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 140-141.

Thomas is found to agree with Matthew and Mark in the use of a purpose clause in the sending of the first servant. This may show that Thomas' account represents the use of the same tradition of Mark, but it does not represent the use of a Marcan editorial trait.[19]

Thomas is said to agree with the Lukan traits of δώσουσιν αὐτῷ in Luke 20:10 and ἴσως in Luke 20:13. Both of these are Lukan readings but not Lukan editorial traits. Luke does not regularly use ἵνα plus the future indicative,[20] nor does ἴσως reveal a Lukan theological bias.[21]

Since none of the editorial traits found in our analysis of the Synoptic passages occur in Thomas, and since those claimed by Schrage are not editorial traits, we can only conclude that Thomas did not use our Synoptic Gospels at this point. Many further points support this conclusion. One, Thomas contains readings unexplainable either by the Synoptic texts or by gnostic tendencies: The master's explanation of the beating of the first servant; the τότε (Plate 93, 11); the ἐπεί (Plate 93:13); the addition of the "ears" saying. Two, the inclusion in Saying 66 of the same Psalm quote found in our Gospels but without the Synoptic connecting-links and without reference to the Old Testament is significant. The latter indicates clearly that the two sayings had been orally transmitted as a pair of sayings for so long that the Old Testament quote was finally also placed on Jesus' lips. If the sources of Thomas had been our Gospels, it seems unlikely that this would have happened even in the light of Thomas' lack of references to the Old Testament. Three, Thomas completely lacks the allegorical references of our Gospels.[22] That he might have eliminated some of them because of their lack of gnostic importance is possible; that he would have eliminated all of them is improbable; that he would have eliminated one such as "my beloved Son" is highly improbable. The complete lack of allegory is far more easily explained by assuming that the original parable was something like the one in Thomas and that it was made into an allegory by the early Church and included as such in our Gospels.[23]

---

[18] The supposed agreement with Matthew 12:34's δούλους αὐτοῦ is a typical case of "identity equals dependence." Schrage notes that Matthew reads "servants" and Thomas "servant" but assumes dependence anyway. Thomas' frequent use of the possessive throughout the parable is enough to explain its presence here without reference to Matthew at all.

[19] Since Thomas uses the purpose clause in a different place and since his clause does not agree completely with either Mark or Matthew, it is not certain that he drew from the same tradition as Mark.

[20] Blass, Debrunner, Funk, A Greek Grammar, #369, 2, pp. 186-187.

[21] This interpretation of the ἴσως comes about from the prior assumption that the story has always been an allegory in which every detail must have a place. If the ἴσως actually is supposed to apply, not to the landlord, but to God, then it does not free God from the blame for sending his son. In fact, it increases the blame as he should have been certain before proceeding on such a course of action. It would also severely limit any notions of omniscience and omnipotence. Furthermore, if Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, pp. 137-206, is correct, Luke did not regard the death of Christ as an error but as an integral part of divinely ordained salvation history. Thus, there is no need to

Thus, Sayings 65 and 66 do not prove a dependence on our Synoptic Gospels, but rather an independence from them.

---

attribute the ἴσως to Luke's hand.

[22] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, p. 143 finds this surprising but assumes that Thomas has systematically eliminated all such things.

[23] Dodd, *Parables*, p. 124, n. 2, says that Jülicher, the father of pure allegory theory, conceded that exactly this might have been the case.

Matthew 21:33-39	Mark 12:1-8	Luke 20:9-15a	Thomas 65
[33] Ἄλλην παραβο-	[1] Καὶ ἤξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παρα	[9] Ἤρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν	
λὴν ἀκούσατε.	βολαῖς λαλεῖν.	λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν	ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ϫⲉ
Ἄνθρωπος ἦν οἰκοδεσ-		ταύτην.	
πότης ὅστις ἐφύτευσεν	ἀμπελῶνα ἄνθρωπος ἐφύ	ἀνθρώπου ἐφύτευσεν	ⲟⲩⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲭⲣⲏ[ⲥⲧ]
ἀμπελῶνα καὶ φραγμὸν αὐ-	τευσεν καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγ-	ἀμπελῶνα,	ⲟⲥ ⲛⲉⲩⲛ[ⲧⲁϥ] ⲛⲟⲩⲙⲁ ⲛⲉⲗⲟⲟ
τῷ περιέθηκεν καὶ ὤρυξεν	μὸν καὶ ὤρυξεν		ⲗⲉ
ἐν αὐτῷ ληνὸν καὶ ᾠκο-	ὑπολήνιον καὶ ᾠκο-		
δόμησεν πύργον καὶ ἐξέ-	δόμησεν πύργον, καὶ ἐξέ-	καὶ ἐξέ-	ⲁϥⲧⲁⲁϥ
δοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς,	δοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς,	δοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς,	ⲛ̄[ϩ]ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲉ ϣⲓⲛⲁ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲣ̄
			ϩⲱⲃ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛⲁϫⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥ ⲕⲁⲣ
καὶ ἀπεδήμη-	καὶ ἀπεδή-	καὶ ἀπεδήμη-	ⲡⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ
σεν. [34] ὅτε	μησεν [2] καὶ	σεν χρόνους ἱκανούς. [10] καὶ	
δὲ ἤγγισεν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρ-			
πῶν, ἀπέστειλεν τοὺς δου-	ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς τοὺς	καιρῷ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς	ⲁϥϫⲟⲟⲩ
λους αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς γεωρ-	γεωργοὺς τῷ καιρῷ δοῦ-	τοὺς γεωργοὺς δοῦλον,	ⲙⲡⲉϥϩⲙϩⲁ̄ⲗ
γοὺς	λον, ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν	ἵνα ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ	ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲛ ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲉ ⲛⲁϯ
λαβεῖν τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ.	λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τοῦ	ἀμπελῶνος δώσουσιν αὐτῷ·	ⲛⲁϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲣⲡⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲁ ⲛⲉ
[35] καὶ λαβόντες οἱ	ἀμπελῶνος, [3] καὶ λαβόντες	οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἐξ απέστειλαν	ⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ ⲁⲩⲉⲙⲁϩⲏⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥ
γεωργοὶ τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ	αὐτὸν κενόν.	αὐτὸν δείραντες κενόν.	ϩⲙϩⲁⲗ ⲁⲩϩⲓⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ

Matthew 21:33-39	Mark 12:1-8	Luke 20:9-15a	Thomas 65
ὃν ἔδειραν, ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτει-			ⲛⲉⲕⲉⲕⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲙⲟⲟⲩ
ναν, ὃν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν.			ⲧϥ
			ⲁⲡϩⲙϩ̄ⲁ̄ⲗ ⲃⲱⲕ ⲁϥϫⲟⲟⲥ
			ⲉⲡⲉϥϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲡⲉϥϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ
			ϫⲉ ⲙⲉϣⲁⲕ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲟⲩ
[36]πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους	[4]καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς	[11]καὶ προσέθετο ἕτερον	ⲁϥϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲕⲉϩⲙϩ̄ⲁ̄ⲗ
δούλους πλείονας τῶν πρώ-	αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον·	πέμψαι δοῦλον	
των, καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς	κἀκεῖνον ἐκεφαλαίω-	οἱ δὲ κἀκεῖνον δείραντες καὶ	ⲁⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲉ ϩⲓⲟⲩⲉ ⲉⲡⲕⲉⲟⲩⲁ
ὡσαύτως.	σαν καὶ ἠτίμασαν.	καὶ ἀτιμάσαντες ἐξαπέστει-	
	[5]καὶ	λαν κενόν. [12]καὶ προσέθετο	
	ἄλλον ἀπέστειλεν· κἀκεῖνον	τρίτον πέμψαι· οἱ δὲ καὶ	
	ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλ-	τοῦτον τραυματίσαντες ἐξ-	
	λους, οὓς μὲν δέροντες, οὓς	έβαλον.	
	δὲ ἀποκτέννοντες. [6]ἔτι	[13]εἶπεν δὲ	ⲧⲟⲧⲉ
[37]ὕστερον δὲ	ἕνα εἶχεν, υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν·	ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνες· τί	ⲁⲡϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ϫⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥϣⲏⲣⲉ
ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν	ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον	ποιήσω; πέμψω τὸν υἱόν	ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲙⲉϣⲁⲕ ⲥⲉⲛⲁ
υἱὸν αὐτοῦ λέγων·	πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων ὅτι	μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἴσως	ϣⲓⲡⲉ
ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου.	ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου.	τοῦτον ἐντραπήσονται.	ϩⲏⲧϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁϣⲏⲣⲉ
[38]οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἰδόντες	[7]ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ	[14]ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ	ⲁⲛⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲉ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲉⲡⲉⲓ

Matthew 21:33-39	Mark 12:1-8	Luke 20:9-15a	Thomas 65
τὸν υἱὸν εἶπον	πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν	γεωργοὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς	
ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· οὗτός	ὅτι οὗτος	ἀλλήλους λέγοντες· οὗτός	ⲥⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ
ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε	ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε	ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος·	ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲕⲗⲏⲣⲟⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ
ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν καὶ	ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἡμ-	ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, ἵνα	ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲁ ⲛⲉⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ
σχῶμεν τὴν κληρονομίαν	ῶν ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία.	ἡμῶν γένηται κληρονομία.	
αὐτοῦ. [39] καὶ λαβόντες	[8] καὶ λαβόντες ἀπέκτει-	[15] καὶ ἐκβαλόντες	ⲁⲩϭⲟⲡϥ
αὐτὸν ἐξέβαλον	ναν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξέβαλον	αὐτὸν	ⲁⲩⲙⲟⲟⲩⲧϥ
ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος καὶ	αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος.	ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος	
ἀπέκτειναν		ἀπέκτειναν.	ⲡⲉⲧⲉⲩⲙ̄ ⲙⲁⲁϫⲉ
(vv. 40-41 omitted)	(v. 9 omitted)	(vv. 15b-16 omitted)	ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲙⲁⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄

Matthew 12:42	Mark 12:10-11	Luke 20:17	Thomas 66
[42]λέγει		[17]ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς	
αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀν-	[10]οὐδὲν	εἶπεν· τί οὖν ἐστιν	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ
έγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς·	τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε	τὸ γεγραμέννον τοῦτο·	ⲙⲁⲧⲥⲉⲃⲟⲉⲓ
λίθον ὃν ἀποδοκίμασαν οἱ	λίθον ὃν ἀποδοκίμασαν οἱ	λίθον ὃν ἀποδοκίμασαν οἱ	ⲉⲡⲱⲛⲉ ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲥⲧⲟϥ
οἰκοδομοῦντες οὗτος ἐγενήθη	οἰκοδομοῦντες οὗτος ἐγενή-	οἰκοδομοῦντες οὗτος ἐγενή-	ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲛⲉⲧⲕⲱⲧ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲡⲉ
εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας. παρὰ	θη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας. [11]παρὰ	θη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας.	ⲡⲱⲱⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲕⲱϩ
κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ	κυριό ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ		
ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλ-	ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλ-		
μοῖς ἡμῶν;	μοῖς ἡμῶν;		

CHAPTER XLI

THE PARABLE OF THE MARRIAGE FEAST

Matthew 22:1-14, Luke 14:16-24 and Saying 64

The Parable of the Marriage Feast occurs in very different versions in Matthew and Luke. In spite of these variations, however, the two have the same theme, namely that others will replace those originally invited, and both have developed from the same original parable.[1]

Matthew's account contains much that is clearly of a secondary nature: Its reference to a king and the marriage feast of his son are clearly allegorical changes; verses 6-7 are an obvious reference to the destruction of Jerusalem; verses 11-13 represent part of another parable; verse 14 was originally an independent saying.[2] Whether or not these changes can be attributed to Matthew's editorial work is not clear. This allegorizing process could be due to his hand, or he could have found it already completed in his sources. Several things add to the probability of the latter. One, Lohmeyer points out several features which seem to betray a Palestinian origin of the allegory.[3] Two, verses 11-14 are simply juxtaposed to the preceding verses without any connecting link whatsoever.[4]

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 175; Manson, Sayings, p. 129; Jeremias, Gleichnisse, p. 61; M'Neile, Matthew, pp. 313-314; Dodd, Parables, p. 121. For the contrary view, Plummer, Luke, pp. 359-360.

[2] Bultmann, History, p. 175; Manson, Sayings, p. 129; Jeremias, Gleichnisse, pp. 61-65; Dodd, Parables, p. 122.

[3] Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp. 316-319.

The Lukan version of the parable also contains a few secondary elements. The second order to invite those on the roads is not only secondary, but also is due to Luke's great interest in the Gentile mission.[5] Verse 24 also appears to be a secondary conclusion to the parable.

Thomas Saying 64 reads:

> Jesus said: A man had guests, and when he had prepared a dinner, he sent his servant to invite the guests. He went to the first, he said to him: My master invites you. He said: Some merchants owe me money, they will come to me this evening. I will go and give them orders. Please excuse me from the dinner. He went to another, he said to him: My master has invited you. He said to him: I have bought a house and am required for a day. I will not be free. He came to another, he said to him: My master invites you. He said to him: My friend is about to be married and I am the one who is to arrange the dinner. I will not be able to come. Please excuse me from the dinner. He went to another, he said to him: My master invites you. He said to him: I have bought a village, I am on my way to collect the rent. I will not be able to come. The servant came, he said to his master: Those whom you invited to the dinner have excused themselves. The master said to his servant: Go out to the streets, bring those whom you will find so that they may dine. The buyers and the merchants shall not come into the places of my Father.[6]

It is clear that Thomas' version betrays no editorial relationship to the Matthean version of the parable. The reference in Thomas to marriage is a mere coincidence while the invitation to those on the street is in the more original Matthean form. Thomas thus omits the only certain editorial traces, the Lukan references to the Gentile mission. Schrage concludes his analysis that no dependence or independence can be concluded from any of the evidence, even though he would like to conclude differently.[7]

---

[4] One might compare how both Matthew and Luke joined the Psalm quote to the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen by adding their own connectives.

[5] Bultmann, History, p. 175; Jeremias, Gleichnisse, p. 62; Conzelmann, Theology of . . . Thomas, p. 111

[6] Since Thomas' version is do different, no comparison of the texts

---

is provided.

[7] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 134-135.

CHAPTER XLII

ON PAYING TRIBUTE TO CAESAR

Matthew 22:15-22, Mark 12:13-17, Luke 20:20-26
and Saying 100

This apophthegm is a perfect example of its type because situation and answer blend together as a unit. Bultmann is convinced that the saying about giving Caesar's things to Caesar and God's things to God never circulated independently.[1] In spite of the unity of the apophthegm, there are enough minor differences between the accounts of our three Synoptic Gospels to suggest that various traditions of it were extant and that Matthew and Luke each used another tradition besides that in Mark.[2]

Some details, however, can be said to be editorial in nature. At least parts of Matthew 22:15 and Luke 20:20 must be attributed to the Evangelists.[3] Luke 20:26 seems also to be Lukan as it serves to set the groundwork for his political apologetics in Luke 23:1bf.[4] Matthew 22:17 may be due to either Matthew or to his sources.

---

[1] Bultmann, *History*, pp. 26, 48. Cf. Taylor, *Mark*, p. 478.

[2] For Matthew one may see Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, pp. 323-325. For Luke, Taylor, *Mark*, p. 478, points out a Hebraism in verse 21; other divergences are ὑμᾶς, φόρος in v. 22, πανουργίαν and πρὸς αὐτοὺς in v. 23, ἔχει in v. 24, πρὸς αὐτούς and τοίνυν in v. 25.

[3] Matthew's τότε . . . πορευθέντες and Luke's ὥστε . . . ἡγεμόνος seem to be editorial.

[4] Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, pp. 85, 139-140, 164.

Thomas Saying 100 reads:

> They showed Jesus a gold (coin) and said to him: Caesar's agents demand taxes from us. He said to them: Give to Caesar the things of Caesar, give to God the things of God, and what is mine give to me.

Those who have held that Thomas used our Synoptic Gospels as his sources agree that in Saying 100 we have simply an abbreviated form of the Synoptic accounts, one which has been completely removed from the scene of those accounts.[5] Schrage details the agreements between Thomas and various groupings of our Gospels and finds that the agreements between their words of the introduction and between Luke and Thomas on the word φόρος for taxes proves Thomas' dependence on them. However, the former agreement is due only to the fact that all three (Matthew, Luke and Thomas) are giving the same apophthegm; these parts are essential and tell nothing about the tradition being used. The latter is not evidence of a trait that can be definitely ascribed to the Evangelist himself.[6]

What is important is that once again those parts which can be attributed to Matthew and Luke with some degree of certainty are again missing. Thomas' form of the saying is obviously secondary and is aimed solely at the "what is mine give me" addition; but this secondary abbreviation can tell us nothing about Thomas' source. If that source were our Gospels, however, a rather strange twist has taken place in a most unimportant detail for Thomas, namely that of the coin involved. Our Synoptic sources insist that it was a denarius—a silver coin;[7] Thomas says it was a gold piece. Perhaps this difference merely reflects a different milieu in which Thomas' saying developed, but it may also be evidence that Thomas' saying comes from another tradition of this saying, one unknown to us before Thomas.

---

[5] Gärtner, *Theology of . . . Thomas*, pp. 32-33; Kasser, *L'Evangile selon Thomas*, p. 111; Grant-Freedman, *Secret Sayings*, p. 189.

[6] It is true that Luke's Gospel as such seems to shy away from such Latinisms as Mark's (Matthew's) σκῆσος, as Blass-Debrunner-Funk, *A Greek Grammar*, section 5, pp. 4-6, show. It is not clear whether this was due to Luke himself or to his sources, as such Latinisms were unpopular. Compare the discussion above on μόδιος (pp. 45-46).

---

[7] According to M'Neile, Matthew, p. 319, it was a special type of coin minted for the express purpose of a census tax and therefore carried Caesar's image.

Matthew 22:15-16a, 17-22	Mark 12:13-14a, 14c-17	Luke 20:20-21a, 22-26	Thomas 100
[15] τότε πορευθέντες οἱ φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεύσωσιν ἐν λόγῳ. [16] καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν	[13] καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν πρὸς αὐτόν τινας τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσιν λόγῳ	[20] καὶ παρατηρήσαντες ἀπέστειλαν ἐγκαθέτους ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου, ὥστε παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος.	ⲁⲩⲧⲥⲉⲃⲉ ⲓ̄ⲥ̄ ⲁⲩⲛⲟⲩⲃⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ
λέγοντας. . . .	[14a] καὶ ἐλθόντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, . . .	[21a] καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες. . . .	ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ ⲛⲁϥ ϫⲉ
[17] εἶπον οὖν ἡμῖν, τί σοι δοκεῖ; ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι ἢ οὔ;	[14c] ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι ἢ οὔ; δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν;	. [22] ἔξεστιν ἡμᾶς Καίσαρι φόρον δοῦναι ἢ οὔ;	ⲛⲉⲧⲏⲡ ⲁⲕⲁⲓⲥⲁⲣ ⲥⲉϣⲓⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ϣⲏⲙ
[18] γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν εἶπεν τί με πειράζετε, ὑποκριταί;	[15] ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν πανουργίαν εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τί με πειράζετε;		

Matthew 22:15-16a, 17-22	Mark 12:13-14a, 14c-17	Luke 20:20-21a, 22-26	Thomas 100
ἐπιδείξατέ μοι τὸ νόμισμα	φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον ἵνα	[24] δείξατέ μοι δηνάριον·	
τοῦ κήνσου. οἱ δὲ προσήνεγ-	ἴδω. [16] οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν		
καν αὐτῷ δηνάριον. [20] καὶ	καὶ		
λέγει αὐτοῖς· τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν	λέγει αὐτοῖς· τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν	τίνος ἔχει	
αὕτη καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή;	αὕτη καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή;	εἰκόνα καὶ ἐπιγραφήν;	
[21] λέγουσιν· Καίσαρος.	οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· Καίσαρος.	οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· Καίσαρος	
τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς·	[17] ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐ-	[25] ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς	ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲩ ϫⲉ
ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καί-	τοῖς· τὰ Καίσαρος ἀπόδοτε	αὐτούς· τοίνυν ἀπόδοτε τὰ	ϯ ⲛⲁ
σαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ	Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ	Καίσαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ	ⲕⲁⲓⲥⲁⲣ ⲛ̄ⲕⲁⲓⲥⲁⲣ ϯ ⲛⲁ
Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ.	τῷ Θεῷ.	Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ.	ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ
			ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲱⲉⲓ ⲡⲉ ⲙⲁⲧⲛ̄
			ⲛⲁⲉⲓϥ
		[26] καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐπιλα-	
		βέσθαι αὐτοῦ ῥήματος	
[22] καὶ	καὶ	ἐναντίον τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ	
ἀκούσαντες ἐθαύμασαν,	ἐξεθαύμαζον ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ.	θαυμάσαντες ἐπὶ τῇ	
καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθαν.		ἀποκρίσει αὐτοῦ ἐσίγησαν.	

CHAPTER XLIII

THE GREAT COMMANDMENT

Matthew 22:34-40, Mark 12:28-34, Luke 10:25-28

and Saying 25

This scholastic dialogue is a unified composition. It was evidently preserved in at least two forms, Mark and Q, although the quantity of common non-Marcan material in Matthew and Luke is scanty. Both Matthew and Luke try not to attribute good intentions to the scribe who questions Jesus; they do this especially by omitting Mark 12:32.[1]

Thomas Saying 25 reads:

> Jesus said: Love your brother as your soul,
> guard him as the apple of your eye.

Although Thomas' gnostic bias is probably behind the abbreviation of this saying, there is evidence that our Gospels were the original source of the saying.[2] It is of importance, however, that Thomas betrays no knowledge of the order of Mark 12 from which the saying comes. His sayings "from" Mark 12 are (in the order of their appearance in Mark) Sayings 65, 66, 100, 25, 39, 89.[3]

---

[1] Bultmann, History, pp. 22-23; Taylor, Mark, pp. 484-485; Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 327.

[2] Cf. Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 70-71.

[3] There is perhaps a faint resemblance to Luke's (Q's) order with reference to the same sayings: Luke 10-Saying 25; Luke 11-Sayings 39 and 89 (also Saying 79, however); Luke 20-Sayings 65, 66, 100 (39 and 89).

CHAPTER XLIV

WOE TO THE SCRIBES AND PARISEES

Matthew 23:13 and 25, Luke 11:52 and 39
and Sayings 39a and 89

These two minatory sayings were evidently part of a collection of seven such sayings in Q, although Matthew's and Luke's versions of Q must have been at this point quite dissimilar.[1] Matthew has combined these seven woes with other similar material and with Mark 12, while Luke has inserted it into a scene introduced by verses 37-39a.

Because of the great divergencies in form and in wording between Matthew and Luke, little else can be said as to editorial work. The τότε in Matthew 15:1 may be due to Matthew as it is typical for his Gospel. Conzelmann sees a Lukan alteration in Luke 11:52 from "the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 25:13) to "knowledge" on the basis of Luke's unwillingness to apply the kingdom concept to anyone prior to the preaching of Jesus.[2] This difference, however, may just as well be due to Luke's version of Q as to Luke himself, although it certainly is secondary. Certainly Luke 11:52 differs in other ways from Matthew

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 113; M'Neile, Matthew, pp. 329, 332; Schmidt, Der Rahmen, p. 280; Manson, Sayings, pp. 94-96, attempts to build a case for M and L on the basis of the divergencies between Matthew and Luke. The fact that the material is essentially the same but the form different is better explained by references to two versions of Q.

[2] Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, pp. 113-114.

23:13 which cannot be ascribed to the same Lukan bias. Luke 11:49 clearly identifies this section of Q as a wisdom passage by having the Wisdom of God speak.[3] The mention of knowledge in such a context is not at all unusual, and the reading should not be attributed to Luke. Luke's work consisted, therefore, in his preference for this reading. Conzelmann's point for Lukan theology is not of any less value with such an understanding.[4]

Thomas Saying 39a reads:

> Jesus said: The Pharisees and the scribes have received the keys of knowledge, they have hidden them. They did not enter and those who wished to enter they did not allow.

Thomas Saying 89 reads:

> Jesus said: Why do you wash the outside of the cup? Do you not understand that he who made the inside is also he who made the outside?

Both of these sayings from Thomas are claimed as proof that Thomas used our Synoptic Gospels as his sources.[5] Saying 39a is supposed to be a mixture of Matthew 23:13 and Luke 11:52: "Pharisees and scribes," "do not allow" from Matthew, "keys of knowledge" from Luke 11:52. Saying 89 is a mixture of Matthew 13:25-26/Luke 11:39-40.

---

[3] Cf. Luke 7:35par. Cf. James M. Robinson, "Logoi Sophon," *Zeit und Geschichte* (ed. E. Dinkler; Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck , 1964), pp. 77-96.

[4] Although γνῶσις occurs only in Luke (1:77 and 11:52) in our Synoptic Gospels, it can hardly be called a Lukan term. Its occurrence in 1:77 is not due to Luke but to his source. Cf. Bultmann, *History*, pp. 295-297. That the term was used in the early Church is clear from the many Pauline references such as Romans 2:20, 11:13, 15:14, etc.

[5] Schrage, *Das Verhältnis*, pp. 91-94, 170-172; Gärtner, *Theology of . . . Thomas*, pp. 36-37; Haenchen, *Botschaft*, pp. 53, 66-67; Grant-Freedman, *Secret Sayings*, pp. 154, 183-184; Kasser, *L'Évangile selon Thomas*, p. 105; Haenchen, *ThR*, XXVII(1961-1962), 326-327.

Schrage offers three major arguments for Saying 39a: One, the appearance of scribes and Pharisees must come from Matthew since Luke uses the term lawyers; two, Thomas follows Luke's editorial change of "kingdom" to "knowledge"; three, the secondary nature of Thomas' readings is shown by agreements with D and other MSS. Argument one cannot be maintained since Matthew was not responsible for the naming of the scribes and Pharisees. The validity of the second stands or falls on one's judgment about the editorial nature of "gnosis." If it is Lukan, Thomas here betrays a Lukan trait and therefore a relationship to Luke. If "gnosis" is not Lukan (as argued above), then the word betrays no relationship of Thomas to Luke. The third argument tells us nothing about the sources for Thomas since such agreements show that Thomas' text does not belong to one strand of the Synoptic Tradition.[6] Thus, although Thomas' text appears to be a mosaic, it is by no means certain that our Gospels furnished the pieces for it.[7]

Schrage's case for Saying 89 is based on two major arguments: One, Luke 11:40 is a secondary form when compared to Matthew 13:26; two, agreements with D and other MSS reveal no originality in Thomas' readings. Even though Luke 11:40 is secondary in form, there is no reason to ascribe that form to Luke. Thomas could have received it from the same (or a similar) source as did Luke. Thus, it is not proof of a dependence on Luke. Unless one is ready to ascribe the reversal of "inner" and "outer" in P^{45} C D , etc., to an unintentional scribal error in the copying of the Lukan text, the agreements of Thomas with these MSS serve only to show that his saying like Saying 39a was transmitted differently in different areas. There is no editorial proof of a dependence on Luke.

---

[6] Quispel, VC, XII(1958), 191, points out Thomas' agreements with many MSS and patristic quotations.

[7] Cf. Wilson, Studies, pp. 75-76, 129.

Matthew 23:13	Luke 11:52	Thomas 39a
οὐαὶ δὲ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ὑμεῖς γὰρ οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε, οὐδὲ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν.	οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, τοῖς νομικοῖς ὅτι ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως, αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε.	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲙⲫⲁⲣⲓⲥⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲅⲣⲁⲙⲙⲁⲧⲉⲩⲥ ⲁⲩϫⲓ ⲛ̄ϣⲁϣⲧ ⲛ̄ⲅⲛⲱⲥⲓⲥ ⲁⲩϩⲟⲡⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲃⲱⲕ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲕⲁⲁⲩ
Matthew 23:25–26	Luke 11:39–40	Thomas 89
[25] οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι καθαρίζετε τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ἐξ ἁρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκασίας. [26] φαρισαῖε τυφλέ, καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου ἵνα γένηται καὶ τὸ ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ καθαρόν.	[39] Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν· νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ φαρισαῖοι τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀπαργῆς καὶ πονηρίας. [40] ἄφρονες, οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ποίησεν;	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̅ⲥ̅ ϫⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲱⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲉⲓ ⲁⲛ ϫⲉ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟϥ ⲟⲛ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲁⲙⲓⲟ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲃⲟⲗ'

CHAPTER XLV

WATCHFULNESS AND FAITHFULNESS

Matthew 24:43-44, Luke 12:35, 39-4
and Sayings 21b and 103

The Lukan pericope (Luke 12:35-48) is a secondary composition concerning the eschaton. It may or may not have been a unit already in Q.[1] On the one hand, verses 35-38 betray a Lukan ethical concern over the delay of the parousia so that the pericope may be a Lukan construction.[2] On the other hand, the pericope may have existed in Q prior to Luke who simply made use of it to stress his viewpoint.

The latter view seems the more likely. The Lukan pericope consists of three sections: Verses 35-38 on wakefulness; verses 39-40, the parable of the Householder and the Thief; verses 41-48, the parable of the Faithful and Wise Steward. An examination of a Synoptic synopsis reveals that Matthew likewise has a pericope (Matthew 24:43-50) which contains these same two parables in the same order and in almost the same wording. This much of the Lukan pericope, therefore, must be assigned to Q. Did Luke himself, then, add the emphasis in verses 35-38 on wakefulness to Q? It would seem not. The same emphasis occurs also in Matthew 24:42-43 and 25:1-13. The latter of these two passages which is the parable of the Wise and Foolish Maidens appears to be a Matthean substitute for Luke 12:35-38. Significantly, it, too, ends with the warning of watchfulness which marks the Lukan verses. Thus, it would seem reasonable to conclude that Luke did not add those verses but found them in his version of Q.

---

[1] Bultmann, History, pp. 118-119.

[2] Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, p. 232.

Three phrases in the two versions of the pericope may be editorial. In verse 39 Luke reads "in what hour" whereas Matthew's parallel reads "in what watch." M'Neile suggests that Luke's reading represents a change on his part for stylistic reasons, that is, he had used the word "watch" in the previous verse.[3] This may be so, but the use of the word "hour" again in verse 40 and its Matthean parallel at least leaves the question open. It seems just as probable that the readings are due once again to different versions of Q.[4] In verse 43 Matthew reads "he would watch and not allow . . ." whereas Luke says only "he would not allow . . . ." Again, an absolute decision cannot be made. The Matthean reading seems to be an addition, but that addition may well have already been made in Matthew's edition of Q. In verse 44 Matthew has an additional διὰ τοῦτο. This also is impossible to attribute with certainty to Matthew. Thus, none of these readings can be said to reflect the intentionality of either of the Evangelists.

Thomas Saying 21b reads:

> Therefore I say this: If the householder knows that the thief is coming, he will be watching before he comes and

---

[3] M'Neile, *Matthew*, p. 357. Cf. Harnack, *Sayings*, p. 33; Klostermann, *Lukasevangelium*, p. 139.

[4] Cf. Bultmann, *History*, p. 171, where both ἐκεῖνο δέ (Matthew 24:43) and τοῦτο δέ (Luke 12:39) are both attributed to Q. Other minor differences strengthen the assumption of two Q versions here: εἴασεν - ἀφῆκεν and οἰκίαν - τὸ οἶκον.

> will not let him dig into his house of his kingdom to carry away his goods. But you watch against the cosmos, gird up your loins with great power . . . .

Thomas Saying 103 reads:

> Jesus said: Blessed is the man who knows in what part of the night the robbers will come, so that he will arise and collect his and gird up his loins before they come in.

Those who hold that Thomas used our Synoptic Gospels as his sources find many Synoptic traces in these two sayings. Schrage gives the most complete statement of the case for Saying 21b.[5] Thomas' introduction to Saying 21, "Therefore I say to you" could be the result of the combination of elements from Luke 12:44 and 37. The part about watching could come from Matthew 24:43. The "goods"motif comes from Mark 3:27par, the parable of the Strong Man. Wilson, who is skeptical of such suggestions about the combining of texts, adds that in such a case one would also have to consider the idea of the sickle as derived from Mark 4:29.[6] The "girding of the loins" should, of course, come from Luke 12:35.[7]

Saying 103 according to Schrage is only a reworking of the same metaphors and lacks any definite textual connections with our Gospels.[8] Jeremias feels that Saying 103 is actually Luke 12:39 reworked on the basis of Luke 12:12-27, the parable of the Pounds.[9]

---

[5] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, pp. 67-69. Cf. Kasser, L'Évangile selon Thomas, p. 58; Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, pp. 141-142; Gärtner, Theology of . . . Thomas, pp. 176-183.

[6] Wilson, Studies, pp. 73f.

[7] Grant-Freedman, Secret Sayings, p. 142.

[8] Schrage, Das Verhältnis, p. 193.

[9] Jeremias, Gleichnisse, p. 94.

Since none of the elements which have supposedly been mixed to form Thomas' sayings are editorial traces, the conclusion of literary dependence cannot be drawn. On the contrary, the synthesis of so many different elements suggest strongly that Thomas' sources were not written ones. The fact that the "burning lamps" motif of Luke 12:35 is missing in Thomas further strengthens this conclusion.

Matthew 24:43-44	Luke 12:39-40, 35	Thomas 21b	Thomas 103
43 Ἐκεῖνο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ᾔδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποίᾳ φυλακῇ ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἂν εἴασεν διορυχθῆναι τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ. 44 διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι, ὅτι ᾗ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὥρᾳ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.	39 Τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ᾔδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποίᾳ ὥρᾳ ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, οὐκ ἂν ἀφῆκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. 40 καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι, ὅτι ᾗ ὥρᾳ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.	ⲇⲓⲁ ⲧⲟⲩⲧⲟ ϯϫⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲉϥϣⲁⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡϫⲉⲉ[·] ⲛ̄ⲏⲉⲓ ϫⲉ ϥⲛⲏⲩ ⲛ̄ϭⲓ ⲡⲣⲉϥϫⲓⲟⲩⲉ ϥⲛⲁⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲙⲡⲁⲧⲉϥⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ϥⲧⲙ̄ ⲕⲁⲁϥ· ⲉϣⲟϫⲧ· ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲡⲉϥⲏⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉ ⲧⲉϥⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲣⲟ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϥⲓ ⲛ̄ ⲛⲉϥⲥⲕⲉⲩⲟⲥ	ⲡⲉϫⲉ ⲓ̄ⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲩⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉ ϩ[ⲛ ⲁϣ] ⲙ̄ⲙⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲛⲗⲏⲥⲧⲏⲥ ⲛⲏⲩ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ϣⲓⲛⲁ ⲉϥⲛⲁⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ̄ϥ ⲥⲱⲟⲩϩ ⲛⲧⲉϥⲙⲛ̄ⲧ·[·] ⲁⲩⲱ
	35 Ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὀσφύες περιεζωσμέναι καὶ οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι.	ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲇⲉ ⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲁⲧⲉϩⲏ ⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲙⲟⲩⲣ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲛ̄ ϩⲛ̄ⲛ ⲟⲩⲛⲟϭ ⲛⲇⲩⲛⲁⲙⲓⲥ	ⲛ̄ϥⲙⲟⲩⲣ̄ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲧⲉϥϯⲡⲉ [ϩⲁ] ⲧⲉϩⲏ ⲉⲙⲡⲁ ⲧⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ

CONCLUSION

The question to which this study has been addressed is, "Is there form critical and redactional evidence which supports the conclusion that Thomas must have obtained his synoptic sayings from our Synoptic Gospels?" At the conclusion of such a study it is necessary to re-evaluate the methodology that has been employed as well as to summarize the results yielded by the method.

With regard to the question of methodology it became increasingly clear as the study progressed that redactional analysis is the best method for determining whether or not our Synoptic Gospels were Thomas' sources. The major presupposition for the use of this method is that the sayings of Jesus circulated orally both before and after the writing of the Synoptic Gospels. A corollary presupposition is that Thomas' origin as a written document in the middle of the second century A.D. places its composition at a time when such oral traditions could have served as its sources. Acceptance of these presuppositions means that mere agreements in the wording of sayings between Thomas and our Gospels proves only that both Thomas and the Synoptic Evangelists knew the same sayings in approximately the same wording and form. Since Thomas could have known the sayings either from the Synoptic Gospels, or from oral tradition, or from a combination of the two, such agreements in wording, whether they reveal a combination of different sayings, a mixture of the various texts of a saying, or a later form of the saying, are not by themselves decisive criteria for the matter of Thomas' sources. The only certain proof that the Synoptic Gospels were Thomas' sources, whether as literary documents or in a quoted form, would be the appearance in Thomas' sayings of changes introduced by one or more of the Synoptic Evangelists, or the appearance of the narrative introductions provided by the Evangelists, or the appearance of a collection or a sequence of sayings which is attributive to one of the Evangelists. Such things necessarily betray the use of Gospels composed by those Evangelists and can be called, therefore, editorial traits.

It is in the determination of what specific words, sentences, and arrangements constitute such editorial traits that leads to differences of opinion between various researchers. Some are willing to assign almost all differences between the texts of the Synoptic Gospels for any given saying to the work of the Evangelists; such a procedure uncovers a rather large number of editorial traits with which Thomas' sayings might agree. The present study has been consciously directed towards a stricter definition of editorial traits, namely, that only such differences or changes in the text of a saying which reveal a specific tendency or intentionality of an Evangelist as revealed elsewhere in his Gospel can be called editorial traits; such a procedure means that fewer such traits will be found than by the previous method. The application of the latter method of determining editorial traits to the many traits found by the use of the former method has revealed that most of them cannot with good cause be attributed to the work of one of the Evangelists. The study has thus strengthened our previous opinion that the criterion of intentionality is the better way to determine editorial traits.

The application of the above method of analysis to the various Synoptic sayings which have parallels in Thomas has resulted in the conclusion that the great majority of Thomas' sayings reveal no such traits at all. Saying 16, for example, lacks the Lukan reference to salvation history in the phrase "from henceforth" (above, p. 116), and Saying 69a lacks the Matthean word "righteousness" (above, p. 34). Thomas' ordering of his sayings also betrays no knowledge of the Synoptic Evangelists' work in arranging the sayings. This is particularly evident, for example, when one studies such collections of sayings as the Beatitudes (above, p. 29) and the parables of Matthew 13 (above, p. 189).

There are a few sayings, however, which may in the opinion of some still betray evidences of editorial traits. In all of these cases this researcher has found a lack of the required intentionality or at least a questionable intentionality; nevertheless, they are the sayings upon which a case for Thomas' use of our Gospels could best be constructed. These sayings are Saying 31 (the question of δεκτός as Lukan, pp. 21-24), Saying 39a (the possibly Lukan change of the word kingdom to knowledge, pp. 250-254), Saying 45 (the secondary development of a possibly Lukan situation, pp. 85-91), Saying 56 (a parallel to a possibly Lukan revision of Mark, pp. 106-112), Saying 79 (the use of a possibly Lukan composition, pp. 211-214), and Saying 104 (a parallel to a possibly Lukan addition of prayer, pp. 96-105).

The conclusion of this dissertation is, therefore, that there is very little redactional evidence, if any, for holding that our Synoptic Gospels were the sources of Thomas' synoptic sayings. In the great majority of sayings there is no such evidence at all. This overwhelming lack of editorial evidence suggests that Thomas' ultimate sources must have been an oral tradition or traditions (to which the catchwords still evident in Thomas witnesses) which existed independently of the written Synoptic Gospels.

The above conclusion does not imply that the tradition (s) contained in Thomas is necessarily or even probably superior to those in the New Testament. On the contrary, it is obvious that most of Thomas' sayings represent the sayings in forms which are more developed than those in the New Testament, and many of the sayings have been altered for gnostic purposes. The few sayings in Thomas which offer earlier forms than those in the New Testament are important for the matter of Thomas' independence from the New Testament and for their confirmation of the basic validity of form critical analysis, but they offer few readings which might be considered superior to New Testament texts. Exactly how Thomas' text was influenced after being written down was not a matter of concern for this study. It does contain numerous relationships to the Western text family of MSS and to the several Coptic translations of the New Testament. Exactly how these readings came about is a matter for further investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts and Lexica

The Apocryphal New Testament, trans. M. R. James. London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1953.

Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, trans. and eds. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Blass, F., and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. and revised by R. W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Crum, W. E. A Coptic Dictionary, compiled with the help of many scholars. London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1939.

Evangelium Veritatis, Coptic text established and translated by Michele Maliline, Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel. Zürich: Rascher Verlag, 1956

The Gospel according to Thomas, Coptic text established and translated by A. Guillaumont, H.-Ch. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till, and Yassah 'abd al Masih. New York: Harper & Bros., 1959.

Grobel, Kendrick. The Gospel of Truth. New York: Abington Press, 1960.

"Hermès Trismégiste," Corpus Hermeticum: Tome I, Traites I-XII, texte etabli par A. D. Nock, et traduit par A.-J. Festugiere. Deuxieme ed.; Paris: Societe E'Edition "Les Belles Lettres," 1960.

Jeremias, J., and Schneemelcher, W. "Sayings-Collections on Papyrus," Edgar Hennecke New Testament Apocrypha, ed. W. Schneemelcher, trans. R. Mcl. Wilson, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963, I, pp. 97-113.

Labib, Pahor. Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo, Vol. I. Cairo, 1956.

Moulton, W. F., and Geden, A. S. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 4th ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

Plumley, J. M. An Introductory Coptic Grammar. London: Home and Van Thal, 1948.

Resch, R. *Agraphe: aussercannonisch Schrift Fragmente* (Zweite Auflage; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906).

Rosenthal, Franz. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961.

Synopsis of the First Three Gospels, ed. Albert Huck, revised by Hans Lietzmann, English edition by F. L. Cross. New York: American Bible Society, 1935.

Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, ed. Kurt Aland. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964.

Till, W. C. *Koptische Grammatik*. 2. Auflage; Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1961.

Vielhauer, Paul. "The Gospel of the Nazareans," *Edgar Hennecke New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. W. Schneemelcher, trans. R. Mcl Wilson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963; I, pp. 139-153.

Commentaries and Synoptic Literature

Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 2nd ed.; London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1957.

Bornkamm, Günther, Barth, Gerhard, and Held, H. J. *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, trans. Percy Scott. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.

Bornkamm, Günther, Barth, Gerhard, and Held, H. J. *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*, 2., durchgesehene Auflage; ("Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament," Bd. 1). Neukirchener Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins Neukirchen, Kreis Moers, 1961.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "The Study of the Synoptic Gospels," *Form Criticism*, ed. and trans. F. C. Grant. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962, pp. 25-31.

Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1960.

Dibelius, Martin. *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. 4th Auflage; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1960.

Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. B. L. Woolf. Revised second ed.; New York: Charles Schribner's Sons, 1965.

Dodd, C. H. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

Evelyn-White, H. Gerard. *The Sayings of Jesus from Oxyrhyncus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920.

Harnack, Adolf. *The Sayings of Jesus*, trans. J. P. Wilkinson. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*. 6. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*, trans. S. H. Hooke (Revised edition; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963).

Jeremias, Joachim. *Unbekannte Jesusworte*. Dritte, unter Mitwirkung von Otfried Hofius völlig bearbeitete Auflage; Gütersloher Verlaghaus Gerd Mohn, 1963.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, trans. R. H. Fuller. London: SPCK, 1954.

Klostermann, Erich. *Das Lukasevangelium*. (2. Auflage; "Handbuch zum Neuen Testament," Band 4.) Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1929.

Klostermann, Erich. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. (2. Auflage; "Handbuch zum Neuen Testament," Band 4.) Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1927.

Köster, Helmut. *Synoptische Ünberlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*. ("Texte und Untersuchungen," Band 65.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Das Evangelium Matthäus*, ed. Werner Schmauch. Kritischer-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament," Begrundet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Mayer; 3. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Manson, T. W. *The Sayings of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1949.

M'Neile, A. H. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1915.

Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*. ("The International Critical Commentary.") Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922.

Robinson, James M. "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ," in *Zeit und Geschichte Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann*, ed. E. Dinkler. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1964.

Schmidt, K. L. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, Unveränderter reprografischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe Berlin 1919; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.

Scott, E. F. *The Literature of the New Testament*. ("Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies," Number XV.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

Soiron, Thaddeus. *Die Logia Jesu*, ("Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen," VI.) Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1916.

Taylor, Vincent. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1952.

Weiss, Bernhard. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1876.

Literature on The Gospel according to Thomas and on Gnosticism

Periodicals

Bartsch, H. W. "Das Thomas-Evangelium und die Synoptischen Evangelien," *New Testament Studies*, VI (1960), 249-261.

Bauer, J.B."Arbeitsaufgaben am koptischen Thomasevangelien," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XV (1961), 1-7.

Bauer, J. B. "De agraphis genuinis evangelii secundum Thomam coptici," *Verbum Domini*, XXXVII (1959), 129-146.

Bauer, J. B. "Das Jesuswort 'Wer mir nahe ist'," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, XV (1959), 446-450.

Beare, F. W. "The Gospel according to Thomas: A Gnostic Manual," *Canadian Journal of Theology*, VI (1960), 102-112.

Cerfaux, Lucien. "Les paraboles du royaume dans l'Évangile de Thomas," *Le Muséon*, LXX (1957), 311-327.

Cullmann, Oscar. "The Gospel according to St. Thomas and its Significance for Research into the Canonical Gospels," *Hibbert Journal*, LX (1962), 117-124.

Cullmann, Oscar. "The Gospel of Thomas," *Theological Digest*, IX (1961), 175-180.

Cullmann, Oscar. "Das Thomasevangelium und die Frage nach dem Alter der ihm enthaltenen Tradition," *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*, LXXXV(1960), 321-334.

Daniélou, J. "Un recueil inédit des paroles de Jésus?" *Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses*, CCCII (1959), 38-49.

DeRosa, G. "Un quinto vangelo? Il 'Vangelo secondo Thommaso," *Civilta Cattolica*, CXI (1960), 496-512.

"El Evangelio de Tomas: Publicaciones y actualidad periodista," *Cultura Biblica*, XVI (1959), 371-373.

Filson, F. V. "New Greek and Coptic Gospel Manuscripts," *Biblical Archeologist*, XXIV (1961), 1-18.

Fitzmeyer, J. A. "The Oxyrhynchus Logoi of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas," *Theological Studies*, XX (1959), 505-560.

Fuller, R-C. "The Two 'Gospels' of St. Thomas," *The Tablet*, CCVIII (1956), 549-550.

Garitte, Gerard. "Bibliographie," *Le Muséon*, LXXIII (1960), 210-222.

Garitte, Gerard. "Les 'Logoi' d' Oxyrhynque et l'apocryphe copte dit 'Évangile de Thomas," *Le Muséon*, LXXIII (1960), 151-172.

Garitte, Gerard. "Les 'Logoi d'Oxyrhynque sont traduits du copte," *Le Muséon*, LXXIII (1960), 335-349.

Garitte, Gerard. "Les paraboles du royaume dans l' évangile de Thomas. I. Text et traduction," *Le Muséon*, LXX (1957), 307-310.

Garitte, Gerard. "Le premier volume de l'édition photographique des manuscrits gnostiques coptes et l'Évangile de Thomas," *Le Muséon*, LXX (1957), 59-73.

Grant, R. M. "Notes on Gnosis," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XI (1957), 145-151.

Grant, R. M. "Notes on the Gospel of Thomas," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XIII (1959), 170-180.

Grant, R. M. "Two Gnostic Gospels," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIX (1960), 1-11.

Grobel, Kendrick. "Light from the Egyptian Darkness," *Pittsburgh Perspective*, I (1960), 9-21.

Guillaumont, A. "Les Logia d'Oxyrhynchos sont-ils traduits du copte?" *Le Muséon*, LXXIII (1960), 325-333.

Guillaumont, A. "Nesteuein ton kosmon," *Bulletin de l'Institute Francais d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire*, 1961.

Guillaumont, A. "Semitismes dans les logia de Jésus retrouvés a Nag-Hammadi," *Journal Asiatique*, CCXLVI (1958), 113-123.

Haenchen, Ernst. "Literatur zum Thomasevangelium," *Theologische Rundschau*, XXVII (1961-1962), 147-178, 306-338.

Higgins, A. J. B. "Non-Gnostic Sayings in the Gospel of Thomas," *Novum Testamentum*, IV (1960), 292-306.

Hofius, Otfried. "Das koptische Thomasevangelium und die Oxyrhynchus Papyri Nr. 1, 654 and 655," *Evangelische Theologie*, I (1960), 21-42, 182-192.

Hull, W. E. "The Gnostic Library from Nag-Hammadi," *Review and Expositor*, LVIII (1961), 200-218.

Hunzinger, C.-H. "Aussersynoptische Traditionsgut im Thomas-Evangelium," *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*, LXXXV (1960), 843-846.

Janssens, Y. "L'Évangile selon Thomas et son caractère gnostique," *Le Muséon*, LXXV (1962), 301-325.

Kasser, Rodolphe. "Les manuscrits de Nag-Hammâdi: faits, documents, problèmes," *Révue de théologie et de philosophie*, IX (1959), 357-370.

Kee, H. C. "Becoming a Child in the Gospel of Thomas," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXII (1963), 307-314.

Klijn, A. F. "Das Thomasevangelium und das altsyrische Christentum," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XV (1961), 146-159.

Knoch, O. "Neue Evangelien? Die Funde von Nag'Hammadi, die Gnosis und das Neue Testament," *Biblische Kirche*, XV (1960), 22-25.

Köster, Helmut. "Die ausserkanonischen Herrenworte als Produkte der christlichen Gemeinde," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLVIII (1957), 220-237.

Krogmann, W. "Heliand, Tatian und Thomasevangelium," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LI (1960), 255-268.

Kuhn, K. H. "Some Observations on the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas," *Le Muséon*, LXXIII (1960), 317-323.

Leipoldt, Johannes. "Ein neues Evangelium? Das koptische Thomasevangelium übersezt und besprochen," *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*, LXXXIII (1958), 481-496.

Ménard, J.-E. "La littérature gnostique copte de Chénoboskion," *Studia Montis Regii*, I (1958), 31-54.

Meyerovitch, E. "The Gnostic Manuscripts of Upper Egypt," *Diogenes* XXV (1959), 84-117.

McArthur, H. K. "The Dependence of the Gospel of Thomas on the Synoptics," Expository Times, LXXI (1960), 286-327.

McArthur, H. K. "The Gospel according to Thomas," *New Testament Sidelights*, (1960), 43-77.

McCaughey, J. D. "Two Synoptic Parables in the Gospel of Thomas," *Australian Biblical Review*, VIII (1960), 24-28.

MacRae, G. W. "The Gospel of Thomas: Logia Jesou?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXII (1960), 56-71.

Nagel, W. "Neuer Wein in alten Achlauchen," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XIV (1960), 1-8.

O'Flynn, J. A. "The Gospel according to Thomas," *Irish Theological Quarterly*, XXVII (1960), 65-69.

Piper, Otto. "A New Gospel?" *Christian Century*, LXXVII (1960), 96-99.

Prigent, Pierre. "Ce que l'oeil n'a pas vu. I Cor. 2,9," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, XIV (1958), 416-429.

Prigent, Pierre. "L'Évangile selon Thomas. État de la question," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses*, XXXIX (1959), 39-45.

Puech, Henri-Charles. "Une collection des paroles de Jésus récemment retrouvé," *Comptes rendus de l'Academie des Inscriptiones et Belles Lettres*, (1957), 146-166.

Puech, Henri-Charles. "Un logion de Jésus sur bandelette funeraire," *Bulletin de la Société Ernest Renan*, III (1955), 6-9.

Quecke, Hans. "Het evangelie volgens Thomas. Inleiding en commenaar," *Streven, Maandblad voor gustesteven en cultur*, XIII (1960), 414-424.

Quecke, Hans. "Sein Haus seines Königsreiches," *Le Muséon*, LXXVI (1963), 47-53.

Quispel, Gilles. "The Gospel according to Thomas," *Listener*, LXIII (1960), 389-390.

Quispel, Gilles. "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XI (1957), 189-207.

Quispel, Gilles. "Der Heliand und das Thomasevangelium," *Vigiliae Christianae*, LVI (1962), 121-151.

Quispel, Gilles. "L'Évangile selon Thomas et les Clémentines," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XII (1958), 181-196.

Quispel, Gilles. "L'Évangile selon Thomas et le Diatéssaron," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XIII (1959), 87-117.

Quispel, Gilles. "L'Évangile selon Thomas et le 'Texte Occidental 'du noveau Testament," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XIV (1960), 204-215.

Quispel, Gilles. "Some Remarks on the Gospel of Thomas," *New Testament Studies*, V (1958-1959), 276-290.

Roques, R. "Gnosticisme et Christianisme: L'Evangile selon Thomas," Irenikon, XXXIII (1960), 29-40.

Saunders, E. W. "A Trio of Thomas Logia," *Biblical Research*, VIII (1963), 43-59.

Säve-Söderbergh, "Evangelium Veritatis och Thomasevangeliet," *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses*, XVI (1959), 5-49.

Schäfer, K. T. "Das neuendeckte Thomasevangelium," *Bibel und Leben*, I (1960), 62-74.

Schippers, R. "Het Evangelie van Thomas een onafhankelijke tradite? Antwoord aan professor Quispel," *Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijschrift*, LXI (1961), 46-54.

Schoedel, W. R. "Naassene Themes in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XIV (1960), 225-234.

Schürmann, H. "Das Thomasevangelium und das lukanische Sondergut," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, VII (1963), 236-260.

Sevenster, J. H. "Het evangelie naar Thomas en de synoptische evangelien," *Vox Theologie*, XXXII (1961), 9-17.

Smyth, K. "Gnosticism in the Gospel according to Thomas," *Heythrop Journal*, I (1960), 189-198.

Strobel, A. "Textgeschichtliches zum Thomas-Logion 86," *Vigiliae Christianae*, 211-224.

Taylor, R. E. "The Gospel of Thomas: Gnosticism and the New Testament," *Christianity Today*, IV (1960), 303-305.

Walls, A. F. "The References to Apostles in the Gospel of Thomas," *New Testament Studies*, VII (1961), 266-270.

Wilson, R. Mcl. "The Coptic Gospel of Thomas," *New Testament Studies*, V (1959), 273-276.

Wilson, R. Mcl. "The Gospel of Thomas," *Expository Times*, LXX (1959), 324-325.

Wilson, R. Mcl. "Further Unknown Sayings of Jesus," *Expository Times*, LXIX (1958), 182.

Wilson, R. Mcl. "The Gnostic Library of Nag Hammadi," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, XII (1959), 161-170.

Wilson, R. Mcl. "Gnostic Origins Again," *Vigiliae Christianae*, XI (1957), 93-110.

Wilson, R. Mcl. "Some Recent Studies in Gnosticism," *New Testament Studies*, VI (1959), 32-44.

Wilson, R. Mcl. "Thomas and the Growth of the Gospels," *Harvard Theological Review*, LIII (1960), 231-250.

Wilson, R. Mcl. "Thomas and the Synoptic Gospels," *Expository Times*, LXXXII (1960), 36-39.

Books

Bauer, J. B. "Echte Jesusworte?" in W. C. Van Unnik, *Evangelien aus dem Nilsand*. Frankfort am Main: Verlag Heinrich Schaffer, 1959, pp. 108-150.

Doresse, Jean. *L'Évangile selon Thomas ou Les Paroles secrètes de Jésus*. Paris: Plon, 1959.

Doresse, Jean. *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d' Égypt*. Paris: Plon, 1958.

Gärtner, Bertil, *The Theology of the Gospel according to Thomas*, trans. Eric J. Sharpe. New York: Harper, 1961.

Giverson, Søren. *Sandhedens Evangelium: Die gnostiske handskriften fra Nildalen*. København: G. E. C. Gad, 1957.

Giverson, Søren. *Thomasevangeliet. Inleiding, oversaethelse og kommentarer*. København: G. E. C. Gad, 1959.

Grant, R. M., and Freedman, D. N. *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1960.

Haenchen, Ernst. *Die Botschaft des Thomas-Evangeliums*. ("Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann, 6.) Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1961.

Hunzinger, C. H. "Unbekannte Gleichnisse Jesu," in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche; Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*, ed. W. Eltester. ("Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für neutestament Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche, 26.) Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1960.

Jonas, Hans. *The Gnostic Religion*, 2nd ed., revised; Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Kahle, Paul. *Bala'izah*. London: Published on behalf of the Griffeth Institue Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, by Geoffrey Cumburledge, Oxford University Press, 1954.

Kasser, Roldolphe. L'Évangile selon Thomas. ("Bibliothèque Théologique.") Neuchâtel, Switzerland: Éditions Delachaux & Niestle, 1961.

Klijn, A. F. *Edessa, de stad de apostel Thomas*. ("Bibliothek von Boeken bij de Bijbel," 28.) Baarn: Bosch & Keuning, 1962.

Leipoldt, J., and Schenke, H.-M. *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codeces von Nag-Hammadi*. ("Theologische Forschung," 20.) Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich-Evangelische Verlag, 1960.

Mead, G. R. S. *Fragments of a Faith Forgotten: The Gnostics*. New Hyde Park, New York: University Books, 1960.

Michaelis, W. *Das Thomas-Evangelium*. ("Calwer Hefte, Nr. 34.) Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960.

Puech, Henri-Charles. "The Gospel of Thomas," in *Edgar Hennecke New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. W. Schneemelcher, trans. R. Mcl. Wilson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963, pp. 278-307.

Quispel, Gilles, and Rengstorf, K. H. "Die Stadt der Morder (Matthew 22:7)," in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*, ed. W. Eltester. ("Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde du älteren Kirche," 26.) Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1962, pp. 106-129.

Schippers, R. *Het Evangelie van Thomas*. ("Boekstreeks," 14.) Kampen, 1960.

Schrage, Wolfgang. "Evangelienzitate in Oxyrhynchus-Logion und im koptischen Thomas-Evangelium," in *Apophoreta, Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen*, eds. W. Eltester und F. H. Kettler. ("Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche," 30.) Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964.

Till, Walter. "Die Edition der koptisch-gnostischen Schriften," in W. C. Van Unnik, *Evangelien aus den Nilsand*. Frankfort am Main: Verlag Neinrich Scheffler, 1959.

Turner, H. E. W., and Montefiore, Hugh. *Thomas and the Evangelists*. London: SCM Press, 1962.

Van Unnik, W. C. *Evangelien aus dem Nilsand*, mit Beitrage von J. B. Bauer and W. C. Till. Frankfort am Main: Verlag Heinrich Scheffler, 1959.

Van Unnik, W. C. Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings. ("Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 30.) Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1960.

Wilson, R. Mcl. Studies in the Gospel of Thomas. London: A. K. Mowbray, 1960.